

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXIII.—JULY, 1908.—No. 131.

SPANISH-AMERICAN EDUCATION.

JOSH BILLINGS, writing as "Uncle Esek" in the *Century Magazine* some twenty-five years ago, made use of an expression which deserves to be frequently recalled. He said: "It is not so much the ignorance of mankind that makes them ridiculous as the knowing so many things that ain't so." We have a very typical illustration of the wisdom of this fine old saw in the history of education here in America as it is being developed by scholarly historical research at the present time. The consultation of original documents and of first-hand authorities in the history of Spanish-American education has fairly worsted a revolution in the ideas formerly held on this subject. The new developments bring out very forcibly how supremely necessary it is to know something definite about a subject before writing about it, and yet how many intelligent and supposedly educated men continue to talk about things with an assumption of knowledge when they know nothing at all about them.¹

Catholics are supposed by the generality of Americans to have come late into the field of education in this country. Whatever there is of education on this continent is ordinarily supposed to be

¹ The materials for this paper were gathered for one of the after-dinner addresses of the First Annual Banquet of the graduates of the Catholic parochial schools of New York, held in connection with the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the New York Diocese. They have been enlarged and followed out to more significant conclusions for this article.

due entirely to the efforts of what has been called the Anglo-Saxon element here. At last, however, knowledge is growing of what the Catholic Spaniards did for education in America, and as a consequence the face of the history of education is being completely changed. Every advance in history in recent years has made for the advantage of the Catholic Church. Modern historical methods insist on the consultation of original documents and give very little weight to the quotation of second-hand authorities. We are getting at enduring history as far as that is possible, and the real position of the Church is coming to light. In no portion of human accomplishment is the modification of history more striking than with regard to education. There was much more education in the past centuries than we have thought, and the Catholic Church was always an important factor in it. Nowhere is this truth more striking than with regard to education here in America in the Spanish-American countries.

Professor Edward Gaylord Bourne, professor of history at Yale University, wrote the volume on Spain in America which constitutes the third volume of "The American Nation," a history of this country in twenty-seven volumes, edited by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, who holds the chair of history at Harvard University. Professor Bourne has no illusions with regard to the relative value of Anglo-Saxon and Spanish education in this country. In his chapter on "The Transmission of European Culture" he says: "Early in the eighteenth century the Lima University (Lima, Peru) counted nearly two thousand students and numbered about one hundred and eighty doctors (in its faculty) in theology, civil and canon law, medicine and the arts." Ulloa reports that "the university makes a stately appearance from without, and its inside is decorated with suitable ornaments." There were chairs of all the sciences, and "some of the professors have, notwithstanding the vast distance, gained the applause of the literati of Europe." "The coming of the Jesuits contributed much to the real educational work in America. They established colleges, one of which, the little Jesuit college at Juli, on Lake Titicaca, became a seat of genuine learning." (Bourne.)

He does not hesitate to emphasize the contrast between Spanish-America and English-America with regard to education and culture, and the most interesting feature of his comparison is that Spanish-America surpassed the North completely and anticipated by nearly two centuries some of the progress that we are so proud of in the nineteenth century. What a startling paragraph, for instance, is the following for those who have been accustomed to make little of the Church's interest in education and to attribute the backward-

ness of South America, as they presumed they knew it, to the presence of the Church and her influence there:

"Not all the institutions of learning founded in Mexico *in the sixteenth century* can be enumerated here, *but it is not too much to say that in number, range of studies and standard of attainments by the officers they surpassed anything existing in English-America until the nineteenth century.* (Italics ours.) Mexican scholars made distinguished achievements in some branches of science, particularly medicine and surgery, but preëminently linguistics, history and anthropology. Dictionaries and grammars of the native languages and histories of the Mexican institutions are an imposing proof of their scholarly devotion and intellectual activity. Conspicuous are Toribio de Motolinia's 'Historia de los Indios de Nueva España,' Duran's 'Historia de las Indias de Nueva España,' but most important of all Sahagun's great work on Mexican life and religion."

Indeed, it is with regard to science in various forms that one finds the most surprising contributions from these old-time scholars. While the English in America were paying practically no attention to science, the Spaniards were deeply interested in it. Dr. Chanca, a physician who had been for several years physician in ordinary to the King and Queen and was looked upon as one of the leaders of his profession in Spain, joined Columbus' second expedition in order to make scientific notes. The little volume that he issued as the report of this scientific excursion is a valuable contribution to the science of the time and furnishes precious information with regard to Indian medicine, Indian customs, their knowledge of botany and of metals, certain phases of zoölogy and the like that show how wide was the interest in science of this Spanish physician of over four hundred years ago.²

After reading paragraphs such as Professor Bourne has written with regard to education in Spanish-America, how amusing it is to reflect that one of the principal arguments against the Catholic Church has been that she keeps nations backward and unprogressive and uneducated—and the South American countries have been held up derisively and conclusively as horrible examples of this. Even we Catholics have been prone to take on an apologetic mood with regard to them. The teaching of history in English-speaking countries has been so untrue to the realities that we have accepted the impression that the Spanish-American countries were far behind in all the ways that was claimed. Now we find that instead of presenting a reason for apology they are triumphant examples of how

² This work was recently the subject of an article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* by my friend, Dr. Ferdinand Ybaria, of New York city.

soon and how energetically the Church gets to work at the great problems of education wherever she gains a position of authority or even a foothold of influence. Instead of needing to be ashamed of them, as we have perhaps ignorantly been, there is reason to be deservedly proud of them. Their education far outstripped our own in all the centuries down to the nineteenth, and the culture of the Spanish-Americans, quite a different thing from education, is deeper than ours even at the present time. It is hard for North America to permit herself to be persuaded of this, but there is no doubt of its absolute truth.

It is only since the days of steam that the English-speaking races in America have come to possess a certain material progress above that of the Spanish-American countries. Bourne says:

"If we compare Spanish-America with the United States a hundred years ago we must recognize that while in the North there was a sounder body politic, a purer social life and a more general dissemination of elementary education, yet in Spanish-America there were both vastly greater wealth and greater poverty, more imposing monuments of civilization, such as public buildings, institutions of learning and hospitals, more populous and richer cities, *a higher attainment in certain branches of science*. No one can read Humboldt's account of the City of Mexico and its establishments for the promotion of science and the fine arts without realizing that *whatever may be the superiorities of the United States over Mexico in these respects they have been mostly the gains of the age of steam.*" (Italics ours.)

While we are prone to think that a republican form of government is the great foster mother of progress and that whatever development that has come in South American countries has been the result of the foundation of the South American republics, Professor Bourne is not of that opinion and is inclined to think that if the Spanish Colonial Government could have been maintained at its best until the coming of the age of steam or well on into the nineteenth century, then the South American republics would have been serious rivals of the United States and have been kept from being so hampered as they were by their internal political dissensions. His paragraph on this matter is so contradictory of ordinary impressions here in the United States particularly, that it seems worth while calling attention to it because it contains that most precious of suggestions, a thought that is entirely different from any that most people have had before. He says (page 316):

"During the first half century after the application of steam to transportation Mexico weltered in domestic turmoils arising out of the crash of the old régime. If the rule of Spain could have lasted

half a century longer, being progressively liberalized as it was during the reign of Charles III.; if a succession of such viceroys as Revilla Gigedo, in Mexico, and De Croix and De Taboada y Lemos, in Peru, could have borne sway in America until railroads could have been built, intercolonial intercourse ramified and a distinctly Spanish-American spirit developed, a great Spanish-American federal state might possibly have been created capable of self-defense against Europe and inviting coöperation rather than aggression from the neighbor in the north."

Lima was the great centre for education in South America, and Mexico, in Spanish North America, was not far at all behind. The tracing of the steps of the development of education in Mexico emphasizes especially the difference between the Spaniard and the Englishman in their relation to the Indian. Bishop Zumaraga wanted a college for Indians in his bishopric, and it was because of this beneficent purpose that the first institution for higher education in the New World was founded as early as 1535. At that time the need for education for the whites was not felt so much, since only adults as a rule were in the colony, the number of children and growing youths being as yet very small. Accordingly the College of Santa Cruz, in Tlaltelolco, one of the quarters of the City of Mexico reserved for the Indians, was founded under the Bishop's patronage. Among the faculty were graduates of the University of Paris and of Salamanca, two of the greatest universities of Europe of this time, and they had not only the ambition to teach, but also to follow out that other purpose of a university—to investigate and write. Among them were such eminent scholars as Bernardino de Sahagun, the founder of American anthropology, and Juan de Torquemada, who is himself a product of Mexican education, whose "*Monarquia Indiana*" is a great storehouse of facts concerning Mexico before the coming of the whites and precious details with regard to Mexican antiquities.

Knowing this, it is not surprising that the curriculum was broad and liberal. Besides the elementary branches and grammar and rhetoric instruction was provided in Latin, philosophy, Mexican medicine, music, botany (especially with reference to native plants), the zoölogy of Mexico, some principles of agriculture and the native languages. It is not surprising to be told that many of the graduates of this college became Alcaldes and Governors in the Indian towns and that they did much to spread civilization and culture among their compatriots. The English-speaking people furnished nothing of this kind, and our colleges for Indians came only in the nineteenth century. It is true that Harvard, according to its charter, was "for the education of the Indian youth of this country in knowledge and

Godliness," but the Indians were entirely neglected and no serious effort was ever made to give them any education. It was a son of the Puritans who said that his forefathers first fell on their knees and then on the aborigines, and the difference in the treatment of the Indians by the English and the Spaniards is a marked note in all their history.

During the next few years schools were established also for the education of mestizo children, that is, of the mixed race who are now called Creoles. In fact, in 1536 a fund from the Royal Exchequer was given for the teaching of these children. Strange as it may seem, for we are apt to think that the teaching of girls is a modern idea, schools were also established for Indian girls. All of these schools continued to flourish and gradually spread beyond the city of Mexico itself into the villages of the Indians. As a matter of fact, wherever a mission was established a school was also founded. Every town, Indian as well as Spanish, was by law required to have its church, hospital and school for teaching Indian children Spanish and the elements of religion. The teaching and parish work in the Indian villages was in charge of two or more friars as a rule and was well done. The remains of the monasteries, with their magnificent Spanish-American architecture, are still to be seen in many portions of Mexico and the Spanish territories that have been incorporated with the United States in places where they might be least expected and that show the influence for culture and education that gradually extended all over the Mexican country.

In the course of time the necessity for advanced teaching for the constantly growing number of native whites began to be felt, and so during the fifth decade of the sixteenth century a number of schools for them came into existence in the City of Mexico. The need was felt for some central institution. Accordingly the Spanish Crown was petitioned to establish authoritatively a university. Such a step would have been utterly out of the question in English-America, because the Crown was so little interested in colonial affairs. In the Spanish country, however, the Crown was deeply interested in making the colonists feel that though they were at a distance from the centre of government, their rulers were interested in securing for them as far as possible all the opportunities of life at home in Spain. This is so different from what is ordinarily presumed to have been the attitude of Spain towards its colonies as to be quite a surprise for those who have depended on old-fashioned history that there can be no doubt of its truth. Accordingly the University of Mexico received its royal charter the same year as the University of Lima (1551). Mexico was not formally organized as a university until 1553. In the light of these dates it is rather

amusing to have the Century Dictionary, under the word Harvard University, speak of that institution as the oldest and largest institution of learning in America. It had been preceded by almost a century, not only in South America, but also in North America. The importance of Harvard was as nothing compared to the Universities of Lima and Mexico, and indeed for a century after its foundation Harvard was scarcely more than a small theological school, with a hundred or so of pupils, sometimes having no graduating class, practically never graduating more than eight or ten pupils, while the two Spanish-American universities counted their students by the thousand and their annual graduates by the hundred.

The reason for the success of these South American universities above that of Harvard is to be found in the fact that Harvard's sphere of usefulness was extremely limited because of religious differences and shades of differences. This had hampered all education in Protestant countries very seriously. Professor Paulsen, who holds the chair of philosophy at the University of Berlin, calls attention to the fact that the Reformation had anything but the effect of favoring education, as has often been said. The picture that he draws of conditions in Germany a century before the foundation of Harvard would serve very well as a lively prototype of the factors at work in preventing Harvard from becoming such an educational institution as the Universities of Lima and Mexico so naturally became. He says in "German Universities and University Studies:"³ "During this period (after Luther's revolt) a more determined effort was made to control instruction than at any period before or since. The fear of heresy, the extraordinary anxiety to keep instruction well within orthodox lines was not less intense at the Lutheran than at the Catholic institutions; perhaps it was even more so, because here doctrine was not so well established, apostasy was possible in either of two directions toward Catholicism or Calvinism. Even the philosophic faculty felt the pressure of this demand for correctness of doctrines. Thus came about those restrictions within the petty states and their narrow-minded established churches which well nigh stifled the intellectual life of the German people."

Because of this and the fact that the attendance at the college did not justify it, the school of medicine at Harvard was not opened until after the Revolution (1783). The law school was not opened until 1817. This is sometimes spoken of as the earliest law school connected with a university on this continent, but, of course, only by those who know nothing at all about the history of the Spanish-American universities. In the Spanish countries the chairs in law were established very early; indeed, before those of medicine.

³ Translated by Thilly, *Scribner's*, 1906.

Canon law was always an important subject in Spanish universities, and civil law was so closely connected with it that it was never neglected.

When the charter of the University of Lima was granted by the Emperor Charles V. in 1551 the town was scarcely more than fifteen years old. It had been founded in 1535. Curiously enough, just about the same interval had elapsed between the foundation of the Massachusetts colony by the Pilgrims and the legal establishment of the college afterward known as Harvard by the General Court of the colony. It is evident that in both cases it was the needs of the rising generation who had come to be from twelve to sixteen years of age that led to the establishment of these institutions of higher education. The actual foundation of Harvard did not come for two years later, and the intention of the founders was not nearly so broad as that of the founders of the University of Lima. Already at Lima schools had been established by the religious order, and it was with the idea of organizing the education as it was being given that the charter from the Crown was obtained. With regard to both Lima and Mexico within a few years a bull of approval and confirmation was asked and obtained from the Pope. The University of Lima continued to develop with wonderful success. In the middle of the seventeenth century it had more than a thousand students, at the beginning of the eighteenth it had two thousand students, and there is no doubt at all of its successful accomplishment of all that a university is supposed to do.

Juan Antonio Ribeyro, who was the rector of the University of Lima forty years ago, said in the introduction to "The University Annals for 1869" that "it cannot be denied that the University of Peru during its early history filled a large rôle of direct intervention for the formation of laws, for the amelioration of customs and in directing all the principal acts of civil and private society, forming the religious beliefs, rendering them free from superstitions and errors and influencing all the institutions of the country to the common good."⁴ Certainly this is all that would be demanded of a university as an influence for uplift, and the fact that such an ideal should have been cherished shows how well the purpose of an educational institution had been realized.

The scholarly work done by some of these professors at the Spanish-American universities still remains a model of true university work. It is the duty of the university to add to knowledge as well as to disseminate it. That ideal of university existence is supposed to be a creation of the nineteenth century, and indeed is

⁴ *Anales Universitarios Del Peru Publicados per el D. D. Juan Antonio Ribeyro, rector de la Universidad de San Marcos de Lima, Vol. III., 1869.*

often said to have been brought into the history of education by the example of the German universities. We find, however, that the professors of the Spanish-American universities accomplished much in this matter and that their works remain as precious storehouses of information for after generations. Professor Bourne has given but a short list of them in addition to those that have already been mentioned, but even this furnishes an excellent idea of how much the university professors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Spanish-America were taking to heart the duty of gathering, arranging and classifying knowledge for after generations. They did more in the sciences than in anything else. It is often thought that our knowledge of the ethnology and anthropology of the Indians is entirely the creation of recent investigators, but that is true only if one leaves out of the account the work of these old Spanish-American scholars. Professor Bourne says:

"The most famous of the earlier Peruvian writers were Acosta, the historian, the author of the 'Natural and Civil History of the Indies;' the mestizo Garciasso de la Vega, who was educated in Spain and wrote of the Inca Empire and De Soto's expedition; Sandoval, the author of the first work on Africa and the Negro written in America; Antonio Leon Pinelo, the first American Bibliographer and one of the greatest as well as of the indefatigable codifiers of the legislation of the Indies. Pinelo was born in Peru and educated at the Jesuit college in Lima, but spent his literary life in Spain."

Of the University of Mexico more details are available than of Peru, and the fact that it was situated here in North America and that the culture which it influenced has had its effect on certain portions of the United States has made it seem worth while to devote considerable space to it. The university was called the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico, because while it was founded under the charter of the King of Spain, this had been confirmed by a bull from the Pope, who took the new university directly under the patronage of the Holy See. The reason for the foundation of the university, as the men of that time saw it, is contained in the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel, which is quoted as the preamble of the constitutions of the university: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made. In Him was Life, and the Life was the light of men." This they considered ample reason for the erection of a university and the spread of knowledge with God's own sanction.⁵

⁵ *Constituciones de la Real y Pontifica Universidad de Mexico, Segunda Ediceon dedocada al Rey Nuestra Senor Don Carlos III. Mexico, 1775.*

The patron saints of the university, as so declared by the first article of the constitutions, were St. Paul the Apostle and St. Catherine the Martyr. Among the patrons, however, were also mentioned in special manner two other saints—St. John Nepomucen, who died rather than reveal the secrets of the confessional, and St. Aloysius Gonzaga, the special patron of students. It is evident that these two patrons had been chosen with a particular idea that devotion to them would encourage the practice of such virtues and devotion to duty as would be especially useful to the students, clerical and secular, of the university. On all four of the feast days of these patrons the university had a holiday. This would seem to be adding notably to the number of free days in a modern university, but must have meant very little at the University of Mexico, since they had so many other free days. The most striking difference between the calendar of the University of Mexico and that of a modern university would be the number of days in the year in which no lectures were given. There were some forty of these altogether. Besides the four patron saints days, the feast day of every Apostle was a holiday. Besides these all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church gave reasons for holidays. Then there was St. Sebastian's Day, in order that young men might be brave, St. Joseph's Day, the Annunciation, the Expectation, the Assumption and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, the Invention of the Holy Cross, the Three Rogation Days and the feast of Our Lady of the Snows. Besides there were St. Magdalen's, St. Ann's, St. Ignatius' and St. Lawrence's Day. These were not all, but this will give an idea how closely connected with the Church were the lectures at the university, or, rather, the intermissions from the lectures. It might be said that this was a serious waste of precious time, and that our universities in the modern time would not think of doing such a thing, but that remark would only come from some one who did not realize the real conditions that obtained in the old-time universities. At the present time our universities finish their scholastic year about the middle of May and do not begin again until October—nearly twenty weeks. At these old universities their annual intermission between scholastic years lasted only the six weeks from the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, September 8, to St. Luke's Day, October 18. They had five weeks at Easter time and two weeks at Christmas time.⁶ They spread their year out over a longer period

⁶ The recent foundation of the Hispano American Museum by Mr. Huntington, of New York city, and the opening of its magnificent library has made it possible to secure material with regard to Spanish American countries very readily. This was more difficult before, as our libraries had comparatively few books on South America, and, of course, paid attention mainly to Europe. The liberality with which this is conducted and

and compensated for shorter vacations by granting holidays during the year. Their year's labor was less intense and spread out over more ground than ours.

The development of the University of Mexico into a real university in the full sense of the old *studium generale* in which all forms of human knowledge might be pursued is very interesting and shows the thorough-going determination of the Spanish-Americans to make for themselves and their children an institute of learning worthy of themselves and their magnificent new country.

Chartered in 1551, it was not formally opened until 1553. Chairs were established in this year in theology, Sacred Scripture, canon law and decretals, laws, arts, rhetoric and grammar. Both Spanish and Latin were taught in the classes of grammar and rhetoric. To these was added very shortly a chair in Mexican Indian languages, in accordance with the special provision of the imperial charter. The university continued to develop and added further chairs and departments as time went on. It had a chair of jurisprudence at the beginning, but its law department was completed in 1569 by the addition of two other chairs, one in the institutes of law, the other in codes of law. In the meantime the university had begun to make itself felt as a corporate body for general uplift by publications of various kinds. Its professor of rhetoric, Dr. Cervantes Salazar, published in 1555 three interesting Latin dialogues in imitation of Erasmus' dialogues. At the moment Erasmus' "Colloquia" was the most admired academic work in the university world of the time. The first of these dialogues described the University of Mexico, and the other two, taking up Mexico City and its environments, give an excellent idea of what the Spanish-American capital of Mexico was three centuries and a half ago.⁷

"The early promoters of education and missions did not rely upon the distant European presses for the publication of their manuals. The printing press was introduced into the New World probably as early as 1536, and it seems likely that the first book, an elementary Christian doctrine called 'La Escala Espiritual' (the ladder of the spirit), was issued in 1537. No copy of it, however, is known to exist. Seven different printers plied their craft in New Spain in

the courteous aid of the librarian, Mr. Martin, has made it possible to consult many documents with regard to the universities of Lima and of Mexico that have not hitherto been available for American readers. This institution will doubtless do much to overcome the foolish prejudice which has kept us from realizing here in the United States how much was accomplished for culture and education in Spanish-America and eradicate the senseless notions that have existed with regard to the backwardness of the sister American States of the South.

⁷ This work was reissued in 1875, with notes and a Spanish translation, by Icazbalceta, under the title "Mexico in 1554."

the sixteenth century. Among the notable issues of these presses, besides the religious works and church service books, were dictionaries and grammars of the Mexican languages, Puga's 'Cedulario' in 1563, a compilation of royal ordinances, Farfan's 'Tractado de Medicina.' In 1605 appeared the first text-book published in America for instruction in Latin, a manual of poetics with illustrative examples from heathen and Christian poets."⁸

The university had been founded just twenty-five years when provision was made for the establishment of a medical department. According to most of the chronicles the first chair in medicine was founded June 21, 1578, though there are some authorities who state that this establishment came only in 1580. In the meantime Mexico had not been without provision of physicians. Dr. Bandelier in his article on Francisco Bravo in the second volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia calls attention to some important details with regard to medicine in Mexico in the early part of the sixteenth century. Bravo, who was probably a graduate of Sevilla and began his practice there, came to Mexico shortly after the middle of the sixteenth century and published the first book on medicine in that city in 1570. Three years before that time Dr. Pedrarias de Benavides had published his "Secretos de Chirurgia" at Valladolid, in Spain, a work which had been written in America and contains an immense amount of knowledge that is invaluable with regard to Indian medicinal practice. Dr. Bravo's work, however, has the distinction of being the first medical treatise printed in America.

The issuance of these books shows the intense interest in medicine in the seventeenth century, but there are other details which serve to show how thorough and practical were the interest of the authorities in securing the best possible medical practice. Strict medical regulations were established by the Municipal Council of the City of Mexico in 1527 so as to prevent quacks from Europe who might think to exploit the ills of the settlers in the new colony from practicing medicine. Licenses to practice were issued only to those who showed the possession of a university degree. This strict regulation of medical practice was extended also to the apothecaries in 1529. Even before this arrangements had been made for the regular teaching of barber-surgeons, so that injuries and wounds of various kinds might be treated properly and so that emergencies might be promptly met even in the absence of a physician by these barber-surgeons.

Though there was no formal faculty of medicine, two doctors in medicine were received at the University of Mexico during the first year of its existence, showing that the institution was considered to have the power to confer these degrees on those who brought

⁸ Bourne, "Spain in America." "Transmission of Culture," pp. 314-5.

evidence of having completed the necessary studies, though it was not yet in the position to provide opportunities for these studies. The hospital of the City of Mexico had been established long before this, had been provided with roomy quarters and had accomplished some excellent work. Just as soon as the medical school of the university was opened the wards of the city hospital seemed to have been used for purposes of clinical teaching.

A chair of botany existed already in connection with the university, and this, with the lectures on medicine, constituted the medical training until 1599, when a second medical lectureship was added. During the course of the next twenty years altogether seven chairs in medicine were founded, so that besides the two lectureships in medicine there was a chair of anatomy and surgery, a special chair of dissection, a chair of therapeutics, the special duty of which was to lecture on Galen's "*De Methodo Medendi*," a chair of mathematics and astrology, for the stars were supposed to influence human constitutions by all the learned men of this time, and even Kepler and Galileo and Tycho-Brahe were within this decade making horoscopes for important people in Europe, and, finally, a chair of prognostics. Most of the teaching was founded on Hippocrates and Galen, and lest this should seem sufficient to condemn it as hopelessly backward in the minds of many, it may be recalled that during the century following this time Sydenham, in England, and Boerhaave, in Holland, the most distinguished medical men of their time and looked on with great reverence by the teachers of ours, were both of them pleading for a return to Hippocrates and Galen. As a matter of fact, the medical school of the University of Mexico was furnishing quite as good a medical training as the average medical school in Europe at that time, at least so far as the subjects lectured on are concerned. Indeed, it was modeled closely after the Spanish universities, which were considered well up to the standard of the time.

In the meantime further chairs in university subjects continued to be founded. Another chair in arts was established in 1586 and further chairs in law and grammar were added at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The Spanish Crown was very much interested in Mexican education, and King Philip II. of Spain, who is usually mentioned in English history for quite other qualities than his interest in culture and education, was especially liberal in his provision from the Crown revenues of funds for the university. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, according to Flores in his "*History of Medicine in Mexico from the Indian Times Down to the Present*,"⁹ the total amount of income from the Crown allowed

⁹ *Historia Della Medicina en Mexico desde la Epoca de los Indios Hasta la Presente Por Francisco Flores, Mexico, 1886.*

the University of Mexico was nearly \$10,000. This was about Shakespeare's time, and so we have readily available calculations as to the buying power of money at that time compared to our own. It is usually said that the money of Elizabeth's time had eight to ten times the buying power of ours. This would mean that the University of Mexico had nearly an income of \$100,000 apart from fees and other sources of revenue. This would not be considered contemptible even in our own day for a university having less than twenty professorships.

The number of students at the University of Mexico is not absolutely known, but, as we have seen, Professor Bourne calculates that the University of Lima had at the beginning of the eighteenth century more than 2,000 students. The University of Mexico at the same time probably had more than 1,000 students, and both of these universities were larger in numbers than any institution of learning within the boundaries of the present United States until after the middle of the nineteenth century. After all, we began to have universities in the real sense of that word—that is, educational institutions giving opportunities in under-graduate work and the graduate departments of law, medicine and theology—not until nearly the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Our medical and law schools did not as a rule become attached to our universities until the second half of the nineteenth century, and even late in that. This was to the serious detriment of post-graduate work and especially detrimental to the preliminary training required for it and consequently to the products of these schools.

Before a student could enter one of the post-graduate departments at the University of Mexico in law or medicine he was required to have made at least three years of studies in the under-graduate departments. When we contrast this regulation with the custom in the United States the result is a little startling. Until the last quarter of the nineteenth century students might enter our medical schools straight from the plow or the smithy or the mechanic's bench and without any preliminary education after two terms of medical lectures consisting of four months each, be given a degree which was a license to practice medicine. The abuses of such a system are manifest and actually came into existence. They were not permitted in Mexico even in the seventeenth century.

It might perhaps be thought that these magnificent opportunities in education were provided only for the higher classes or concerned only book learning and the liberal and professional studies. Far from any such exclusiveness as this, their schools were thoroughly rounded and gave instruction in the arts and crafts and recognized the value of manual training. We have only come to appreciate in

the last few decades how much we have lost in education in America by neglecting these features of education for the masses. While Germany has manual training for over fifty per cent. of the children who go to her schools, here in the United States we provide them for something less than one per cent. of our children. They made no such mistake as this in the Spanish-American countries. Indeed, Professor Bourne's paragraph on this subject is perhaps the most interesting feature of what he has to say with regard to education in Spanish-America. The objective methods of education as he depicts them, the thoroughly practical content of education and the fact that the Church was one of the main factors in bringing about this well rounded education is of itself a startling commentary on the curiously perverted notions that have been held in the past with regard to the comparative value of education in Spanish and in English-America and the attitude of the Church toward these educational questions:

"Both the Crown and the Church were solicitous for education in the colonies, and provisions were made for its promotion on a far greater scale than was possible or even attempted in the English colonies. The early Franciscan missionaries built a school beside each church, and in their teaching abundant use was made of signs, drawings and paintings. The native languages were reduced to writing, and in a few years Indians were learning to read and write. Pedro de Gante, a Flemish lay Brother and a relative of Charles V., founded and conducted in the Indian quarter in Mexico a great school attended by over a thousand Indian boys, which combined instruction in elementary and higher branches, the mechanical and the fine arts. In its workshops the boys were taught to be tailors, carpenters, blacksmiths, shoemakers and painters."

If there was all this of progress in education in Spanish-American countries in advance of what we had in the United States, people will be prone to ask where, then, are the products of this Spanish-American education? This is only a fair question, and if the products cannot be shown their education, however pretentious, must have been merely superficial or hollow and must have meant nothing for the culture of their people. We are sure that most people would consider the question itself quite sufficient argument, for it would be supposed to be unanswerable. Such has been the state of mind created by history as it is written for English-speaking people that we are not at all prepared to think that there can possibly be in existence certain great products of Spanish-American education that show very clearly how much better educational systems were developed in Spanish than in English-America. The fact that we do not know them, however, is only another evidence of the one-

sidedness of American education in the North even at the present time. Our whole attitude toward the South American peoples, our complacent self-sufficiency from which we look down on them, our thorough-going condescension for their ignorance and backwardness is all founded on our lack of real knowledge with regard to them.

The most striking product of South American education was the architectural structures which the Spanish-American people erected as ornaments of their towns, memorials of their culture and evidences of their education. The cathedrals in the Spanish towns of South America and Mexico are structures as a rule fairly comparable with the ecclesiastical buildings erected by towns of the same size in Europe. As a rule they were planned at least in the sixteenth century, and most of them were finished in the seventeenth century. Their cathedrals are handsome architectural structures worthy of their faith and an enduring evidence of their taste and love of beauty. The ecclesiastical buildings, the houses of their Bishops and Archbishops and their monasteries were worthy of their cathedrals and churches. Most of them are beautiful, all of them are dignified, all of them had a permanent character that has made them endure down to our day and has made them an unfailing ornament of the towns in which they are. Their municipal buildings partook of this same type. Some of them are very handsome structures. Of their universities we have already heard that they were imposing buildings from without, handsomely decorated within.

With regard to the churches, of course it may be said that the spirit of the Puritans was entirely opposed to anything like the ornamentation of their churches, and that indeed these were not churches in the sense of the word, but were merely meeting houses. Hence there was not the same impulse to make them beautiful as lifted the Spanish-Americans into their magnificent expressions of architectural beauty. On the other hand, there are other buildings with regard to which, if there had been any real culture in the minds of the English-Americans, we have a right to expect some beauty as well as usefulness. If we contrast for a moment the hospitals of English and of Spanish-America the difference is so striking as to show the lack of some important quality in the minds of the builders at the north. Spanish-American hospitals are among the beautiful structures with which they began to adorn their towns early, and some of them remain at the present day as examples of the architectural taste of their builders. They were usually low, often of but one story in height, with a courtyard and with ample porticos for convalescents and thick walls to defend them against the heat of the climate. In many features they surpass many hospitals that have been built in America until very recent years.

They were modeled on the old mediæval hospitals, some of which are very beautiful examples of how to build places for the care of the ailing.

It must not be forgotten that the Spanish-Americans practically invented the new style of architecture. How effective that style is we had abundant opportunity to see when it was employed for the buildings of the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo. That style is essentially American. It is the only new thing that America has contributed to construction since its settlement. How thoroughly suitable it was for the climate for which it was invented those who have had experience of it in the new hotels erected in Florida in the last decade or so can judge very well. Many of its effects are in adaptation of classical formulæ buildings to the warm yet uncertain climate of many parts of South America. Some of the old monasteries constructed after this style are beautiful examples of architecture in every sense of the word. If the Spanish-American monks had done nothing else but leave us this handsome new model in architecture they would not have lived in vain nor would their influence in American life have been without its enduring effects. This is a typical product of the higher culture of the South Spanish-American people.

Contrast for a moment with this the state of affairs that have existed with regard to our church buildings and our public structures of all kinds in North America down to the latter half of the nineteenth century. We have no buildings dating from before the nineteenth century that have any pretension to architectural beauty. They were built merely for utility. Some of them still have an interest for us because of historical associations, but they are a standing evidence of the lack of taste of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors. The English poet Yeats said at a little dinner given to him just before he left this country ten years ago that no nation can pretend to being cultured until the very utensils in the kitchen are beautiful as well as useful. What is to be said then of a nation that erects public buildings that are to be merely useful? As a matter of fact, most of them were mere barracks. The American people woke up somewhat in the nineteenth century, but the awakening was very slow. A few handsome structures were erected, but it is not until the last decade or two that we have been able to awaken public taste to the necessity for having all our public buildings beautiful as well as useful.

The effect of this taste for structural beauty on the appearance of the streets of their towns was an important element in making them very different from our cramped and narrow pathways. The late Mr. Ernest Crosby once expressed this very emphatically in an

after dinner speech by detailing his experience with regard to Havana. He had visited the Cuban capital some twenty years ago and found it very picturesque in its old Spanish ways. It is true the streets are dirty and the death rate was somewhat high, but the vista that you saw when you came around the corner of a street was not the same that you have seen around every other corner for twenty miles, but it was different. It was largely a city of homes, with some thought of life being made happy rather than merely being laborious. It was the place to live in and enjoy life while it lasted, and not merely a place to exist in and make money. He came North by land. The first town that he struck on the mainland he said reminded him of Hoboken. Every other town that he struck in the North reminded him more and more of Hoboken until he came to the immortal Hoboken itself. The American end of the Anglo-Saxon idea seemed to him indeed to make all the towns like Hoboken as far as possible. There is only one town in this country that is not like Hoboken, and that is Washington, and whenever we let the politicians work their way like that witness, the Pension Building, it has a tendency to grow more and more like Hoboken. Perhaps we shall be able to save it. As for Havana, he said he understood that the death rate had been cut in two and that yellow fever was no longer epidemic there, but he understood also that the town was growing more and more like Hoboken, so that he scarcely dared to go back to see it.

The parable has a lesson that is well worth while driving home for our people, for it emphasizes a notable lack of culture among the American people which did not exist among the Spanish-Americans, a lack which we did not realize until the last decade or two, though it is an important index of true culture. The hideous buildings that we have allowed ourselves to live in in America, and, above all, that we have erected as representing the dignity of city and only too often even of state, together with the awful evidence of graft whenever an attempt has been made to correct this false taste and erect something worthy of us, the graft usually spoiling to a very great extent our best purposes, is an indictment of lack of culture in American life that amounts to a conviction of failure of our education to be liberal in the true sense of the word.

There were other products of Spanish-American education quite as striking as the architectural beauties with which Mexicans and South Americans adorned their towns. Quite as interesting, indeed, as their architecture is their literature. Ordinarily we are apt to assume that because we have heard almost nothing of Spanish-American literature, there must be very little of it, and what little there is must have very little significance. This is only another

one of these examples of how ridiculous it is to know something that ain't so. Spanish-American literature is very rich. It begins very early in the history of the Spanish settlement. It is especially noteworthy for its serious products, and when the world's accounts of the enduring literature of the past four centuries will be made up much more of what was written in South America will live than what has been produced in North America. This seems quite unpatriotic, but it is only an expression of proper estimation of values without any of that amusing self-complacency which so commonly characterizes North American estimation of anything that is done by our people.

South American literature in the best sense of that much abused term begins shortly after the middle of the sixteenth century with the writing of the Spanish poet Ercilla's epic, "*Araucana*," which was composed in South America during the decade from 1550 to 1560. This is a literary work of genuine merit that has attracted the attention of critics and scholars of all times and has given its author a significant place even in the limited field of epic poetry among the few great names that the world cares to recall in this literary mode. Voltaire considered this epic poem a great contribution to literature, and in the prefatorial essay to his own epic, the "*Henriade*," he praises it very highly. The poem takes its name from the Araucanos Indians, who had risen in revolt against the Spaniards in Chile and against whom the poet served for nearly ten years. He did not learn to despise them, however, and while the literature which does justice to the lofty sentiments which sometimes flowed from mouths of great Indian chiefs is supposed to be much more recent, Ercilla's most frequently extolled passage is the noble speech which he has given to the aged chief Colocolo in the "*Araucana*."

This expedition against the Araucanos inspired two other poets—Pedro de Ona, who wrote "*Arauco Domado*," written near the end of the century, and "*Araucana*," written by Diego de Santisteban, whose poem also saw the light before the seventeenth century opened. A fourth poet, Juan de Castellanos, better than either of these wrote "*Elegies of Illustrious Indian Chiefs*." He was a priest who had served in America and who remembered some of the magnificent traits of the Indians that he had observed during his life among them and made them the subject of his poetry. This was only the beginning of a serious Spanish-American literature that has continued ever since. Father Charles Warren Currier in a series of lectures at the Catholic Summer School three years ago did not hesitate to say that the body of Spanish-American literature was much larger and much more important and much more of it was

destined to endure than of our English-American literature. In the light of what these Spaniards had done for education in their universities and for the beauty of life in their cities by their architecture it is not as surprising as it might otherwise be, however. All of these things stand together and are confirmations one of the other.

The most interesting product of Spanish-American education, however, the one that shows that it really stood for a higher civilization of ours, remains to be spoken of. It consists of their treatment of the Indians. From the very beginning, as we have just shown, their literature in Spanish-America did justice to the Indians. They saw his better traits. It is true they had a better class of Indians as a rule to deal with, but there is no doubt also that they did much to keep him on a higher level, while everything in North America that was done by the settlers was prone to reduce the native in the scale of civilization. He was taught the vices and not the virtues of civilization, and little was attempted to uplift him. Just as the literary men were interested in the better side of his character, so the Spanish-American scientists were interested in his folklore, in his medicine, in his arts and crafts, in his ethnology and anthropology—in a word, in all that North Americans have only come to be interested in during the nineteenth century. Books on all these subjects were published and now constitute a precious fund of knowledge with regard to the aborigines that would have been lost only for the devotion of Spanish-American scholars.

It is not surprising then that the Indian himself, with all this interest in him, did not disappear, as in North America, but has remained to constitute the basis of the South American peoples. If the South American peoples are behind our own in anything, it is because, after all, large elements in this have been raised from a state of semi-barbarism into civilization, while our people have all come from nations civilized not long since and we have none at all of the natives left. Wherever the English went always aborigines disappeared before them. The story is the same in New Zealand and Australia as it is in North America, and it would be the same in India only for the teeming millions that live in that peninsula, for whom Anglo-Saxon civilization has never meant an uplift in any sense of the word, but rather the contrary. The white man's burden has been to carry the Indian, instilling into him all the vices, until no longer he could cling to his shifty master and was shaken off to destruction.

This story of the contrast of the treatment of the Indian at the North and the South is probably the best evidence for the real depth of culture that the magnificent education of the Spaniards so early

and so thoroughly organized in their colonies accomplished for this continent. Alone it would stand as the highest possible product of the interest of the Spanish Government and the Spanish Church in the organization not only of education, but of government in such a way as to bring happiness and uplift for both natives and colonists in the Spanish-American countries. Abuses there were, as there always will be where men are confirmed and where the superior race comes in contact with the inferior. These abuses, however, were exceptions and not the rule. The policy instituted by the Spaniards and maintained in spite of the tendencies of men to degenerate into tyranny and misuse of the natives is well worthy of admiration. English-speaking history has known very little of it until comparatively recent years. Mr. Sidney Lee, the editor of the English Biographical Dictionary and the author of a series of works on Shakespeare which have gained for him recognition as probably the best living authority on the history of the Elizabethan times, wrote a series of articles which appeared in *Scribner's* last year on "The Call of the West." This was meant to undo much of the prejudice which exists with regard to Spanish colonization in this country and to mitigate the undue reverence in which the English explorers and colonists have been held by comparison. There seems every reason to think then that this newer, truer view of history is gradually going to find its way into circulation.

In the meantime it is amusing to look back and realize how much prejudice has been allowed to warp English history in this matter, and how as a consequence of the determined, deliberate efforts to blacken the Spanish name we have had to accept as history exactly the opposite view in the reality to this matter. Lest we should be thought to be exaggerating, we venture to quote one of the opening paragraphs of Mr. Sidney Lee's article as it appeared in *Scribner's* for May, 1907: "Especially has theological bias justified neglect or facilitated misconception of Spain's rôle in the sixteenth century drama of American history. Spain's initial adventures in the New World are often consciously or unconsciously overlooked or underrated in order that she may figure in the stage of history as the benighted champion of a false and obsolete faith, who was vanquished under divine protecting Providence by English defenders of the true religion. Many are the hostile critics who have painted sixteenth century Spain as the avaricious accumulator of American gold and silver, to which she had no right, as the monopolist of American trade, of which she robbed others, and as the oppressor and exterminator of the weak and innocent aborigines of the new continent who implored her presence among them. Cruelty in all its hideous forms is indeed commonly set forth as Spain's only

instrument of rule in her sixteenth century empire. On the other hand, the English adventurer has been credited by the same pens with a touching humanity, with the purest religious aspirations, with a romantic current which was always at the disposal of the oppressed native.

"No such picture is recognized when we apply the touchstone of the oral traditions, printed books, maps and manuscripts concerning America which circulated in Shakespeare's England. There a predilection for romantic adventure is found to sway the Spaniard in even greater degree than it swayed the Elizabethan. Religious zeal is seen to inspirit the Spaniard more constantly and conspicuously than it stimulated his English contemporary. The motives of each nation are barely distinguishable one from another. Neither deserves to be credited with any monopoly of virtue or vice. Above all, the study of contemporary authorities brings into a dazzling light which illumines every corner of the picture the commanding facts of the Spaniard's priority as explorer, as scientific navigator, as conqueror, as settler."

Here is magnificent praise from one who cannot be suspected of national or creed affinities to bias his judgment. He has studied the facts and not the prejudiced statements of his countrymen. The more carefully the work of the Spaniard in America during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is studied the more praise is bestowed upon him. The more a writer knows of actual conditions the more does he feel poignantly the injustice that has been done by the Protestant tradition which refused the good that were accomplished by the Catholic Spanish and which neglected, distorted and calumniated his deeds and motives. This bit of Protestant tradition is, after all, only suffering the fate that every other Protestant position has undergone during the course of the development of scientific historical criticism. Every step toward the newer, truer history has added striking details to the picture of the beneficent influences of the Church upon her people in every way. It has shown up pitilessly the subterfuges, the misstatements and the positive ignorance which has enabled Protestantism to maintain the opposite impression in people's minds in order to show how impossible was agreement with the Catholic Church, since it stood for backwardness and ignorance and utter lack of sympathy with intellectual development.

Now we find everywhere that just the opposite was true. Wherever the Reformation had the opportunity to exert itself to the full, education and culture suffered. Erasmus said in his time wherever Lutheranism reigns there is an end of literature. Churches and cathedrals that used to be marvelous expressions of the artistic and

poetic feeling of the people became the ugliest kind of mere meeting houses. Rev. Augustus Jessop, himself an Anglican clergyman, tells how "art died out in rural England" after the Reformation, which he calls *The Great Pillage*, and "King Whitewash and Queen Ugliness ruled supreme for centuries." The same thing happened in Germany, and education was affected quite as much as art. German national development was delayed, and she has come to take her place in world influence only in the nineteenth century, after most of the influence of the religious revolt led by Luther in the sixteenth century has passed away. These are but other of the striking differences in recent history that are so well typified by the contrast between what was accomplished for art and culture and architecture and education by the Catholic Spaniard and the English Protestant here in America during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Truth is coming to her own at last, and it is in the history of education particularly that advances are being made which change the whole aspect of the significance of history during the past 350 years.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York.

PIUS VII. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

II.

SHORTLY after his arrival in Paris Mgr. Spina was presented to the First Consul by Talleyrand, the former Bishop of Autun, who was then Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Papal Envoy in his report of the interview states that Bonaparte welcomed him gladly. He spoke with much respect of Pius VII., and then repeated what he had already said to Cardinal Martiniana with regard to his plans for the reconciliation of France with the Holy See.¹ The negotiations for that purpose were at once begun. The French Government appointed as its representative the Abbé Bernier, who had been the parish priest of Saint Laud, at Angers, and had some time previously forsaken the cause of the Bourbons to become a partisan of the First Consul. Bernier was one of those priests who, at the risk of being imprisoned or exiled, had refused to take the oath prescribed by the *Constitution Civile du Clergé*. He had joined the peasants who fought so bravely in *la Vendée* for the

¹ Boulay de la Meurthe, Documents sur la négociation du Concordat. Le Paris, 1891-1905. Vol. I., No. 81, p. 123. Spina à Consalvi, 12 Nov., 1800. "L'accoglimento del Primo Console fù, si può dire, festoso."

Church and the King, and owing to his eloquence and his talent for administration had soon acquired considerable influence in the council which directed the movements of the royalists. When the Vendean bands had been broken up and dispersed by a succession of disasters, he remained concealed in the country and tried to reorganize an army. But the principal leaders had already fallen; it was useless to offer further resistance to the Republican troops, and when Bonaparte showed that he intended to follow a policy of conciliation the abbé consented to treat. At his persuasion the peasants laid down their arms on condition of obtaining religious liberty, and thenceforth he served Bonaparte as devotedly as he had served the King of France. Bernier's conduct has been severely blamed by those whose cause he abandoned, but the only serious reproach that he seems to merit is that in the negotiations for the Concordat he obeyed too blindly the orders of Bonaparte, whose views he zealously supported, even when they were opposed to the interests of the Church.²

With the exception of the Abbé Bernier, who, though rather Gallican in his opinions, was sincerely anxious for the restoration of religion in France, all those who surrounded the First Consul and formed part of his government were hostile to the Church and opposed to reconciliation with Rome. The influence of two persons especially, whom he frequently consulted on religious questions, tended to prevent him from making any concessions to the Holy See and to inspire him with suspicion of every act of the Papal ministers and envoys. One of these evil councillors was Henri Grégoire, the schismatic Bishop of Blois and previously parish priest of Embermesnil, in Lorraine. When a member of the *Assemblée Constituante* he was one of the first to take the oath of the *Constitution Civile*, and when, later on, he sat in the convention, he was distinguished by his fanatical ardor for the abolition of the monarchy. At the time of the trial of Louis XVI. he was in Savoy, whither he had been sent with three others to spread the principles of the Revolution, and he gave by letter his vote in favor of the King's condemnation without appeal to the people, but insisted on the omission of the words "to death," which his colleagues wished to insert. A Jansenist and a Gallican, he was intensely hostile to Rome,³ and

² Le Cardinal Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801. Ses origines—son histoire*. Paris, 1903, p. 54. "Ce qu'on cherche inutilement chez Bernier, c'est une velléité d'indépendance et une révolte d'honnête homme, dans deux ou trois circonstances où l'honnête homme aurait dû se cabrer et refuser le service. Il lui a manqué l'honneur d'encourir, ne fût ce qu'une fois, la colère du Premier Consul."

³ Documents, etc., I., No. 192, p. 301. Spina à Consalvi, Parigi, 22 Gennaio, 1801. "To che l'intruso Grégoire à foi una guerra atroce, ed egli ha insinuata at Primo Console tutta la diffidenza possibile verso la cotte di Roma."

his restless activity in the service of the schismatical church entitled him to be looked upon as its head. Cardinal Mathieu says of him: "The Revolution has not produced a more singular personage, nor a rhetorician more pleased with himself, nor a more astounding mixture of all sorts of contradictions, of false ideas and of generous sentiments." Bonaparte allowed him to hold a council of constitutional Bishops and priests in the Cathedral of Notre Dame while the negotiations for the Concordat were in progress, with the object apparently of intimidating the Papal envoys and obliging them to make the concessions he wanted, by showing them that if he pleased he could establish a Gallican Church independent of the Pope; but when the Concordat was signed he ordered this schismatical assembly to bring its proceedings to an end.

The second and the better known of these theological advisers, Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1752-1838), the former Bishop of Autun, was by far the more dangerous, as his official position gave him more power and brought him into more frequent communication with the First Consul. A member of a younger branch of the Counts of Périgord, he had been forced by his family to enter the Church very much against his will and by their influence had been named Bishop of Autun in 1788. He was elected as a representative of the clergy at the *États Généraux* of 1789, where he joined those deputies who held their meeting in defiance of the King, and he supported every subversive and anti-religious measure brought before the *Assemblée Nationale Constituante*, of which he was one of the presidents. It was he who proposed that the nation should seize the property of the Church to pay its debts; he was one of the first members of the clergy to take the oath prescribed by the *Constitution Civile*, and although that law had suppressed his Diocese of Autun, he consecrated two of the schismatic Bishops who had been elected by the people. A diplomatic mission to London and a visit to America, where he lived for some time at Philadelphia (1794-1795), enabled him to avoid the sanguinary rule of Robespierre and of the Committee of Public Safety, and on his return to Paris he was named Minister of Foreign Affairs to the government of the Directory, mainly by the influence of Madame de Stael (July, 1797). In that capacity he had a share in the violent suppression on the 18 Fructidor (4th September, 1797) of the moderate and conservative section of the two Councils and of the Directory by the three Directors who represented a more intolerant and Jacobin policy. It was in pursuance also of that policy that General Berthier was ordered to march on Rome to dethrone Pius VI. and send him into exile and to establish the Roman Republic. Talleyrand may, therefore, be looked upon as the accomplice of the Directory in these

crimes, which entailed so much persecution to the Church and suffering to the Holy Father. The growing unpopularity of the Directory, owing to its incapacity and its venality, led Talleyrand to resign (30th July, 1799), but on the return from Egypt of General Bonaparte, whose coming greatness he had long foreseen, he assisted him by his advice and his intrigues to bring about the revolution of the 18th Brumaire (9th November, 1799) and the establishment of the Consulate, when he again reëntered the Ministry.

Mgr. Spina does not seem to have been aware at first that Talleyrand was hostile to the Concordat, for the Minister received him very courteously and gave him to understand that he and Bonaparte were agreed in desiring the restoration of the Catholic religion in France.⁴ The ex-Bishop must even have led the Papal Envoy to think that there was some hope of his approaching conversion, for Mgr. Spina wrote to Cardinal Consalvi: "The Minister Talleyrand will soon, I believe, make his recantation to the Holy Father."⁵ Both Bonaparte and Talleyrand, however, professed to be much in fear of the Jacobins, who still formed a very strong party, especially in Paris, and Mgr. Spina was, therefore, requested to observe the utmost secrecy with regard to the purpose of his mission, in order not to excite the opposition which the atheists and the schismatical clergy would not have failed to offer.

The Abbé Bernier lost no time in presenting to Mgr. Spina in a series of letters, the cunning and perfidious tone of which betray the influence of Talleyrand,⁶ the conditions of the Concordat which Bonaparte had already mentioned to Cardinal Martiniana. The first of these demanded that all the Bishops of France should resign their sees; for the government professed to be anxious to restore peace and unity in France, and to fear that in the case of at least some of these prelates their return might provoke fresh disturbances. The government declined to name those whose principles it considered most likely to be incompatible with the tranquillity of the State, as that might degenerate into disagreeable personalities. It preferred to insist on a general resignation at the bidding of the Head of the Church, after which some of the prelates, against whom there existed no animosity such as might paralyze their labors and their administration, might be again chosen.⁷ The real motive for the complete renovation of the hierarchy was not, of course, frankly

⁴ Documents, I., No. 102, p. 150. Spina à Consalvi, 10th Déc., 1800. "Non dubito che Bonaparte desideri ristabilire in Francia la religione cattolica. ;!Si accorda con esso il ministro Talleyrand."

⁵ *Id.*, No. 89, p. 137. Spina à Consalvi, 22 Nov., 1800. "Presto, credo, il ministro Talleyrand canterà a Sua Santità la sua palinodia."

⁶ Le R. P. Dom François Chamard, Bénédictin, Prieur de Saint-Maur-sur-Loire, *La Révolution, le Concordat et la Liberté religieuse*, p. 96.

stated, but it might easily be guessed. It was the desire of getting rid of Bishops who still retained their monarchical principles and replacing them by others who might, it was hoped, be more submissive to the First Consul, as to him they would owe their nomination.

In the second of these letters the seizure of the property of the Church was represented as having been caused by the necessities of the State during the Revolution at a time when all classes of citizens were obliged to make very great sacrifices for their country. The title of the purchasers was guaranteed by the law,⁸ and any attempt to expropriate them would therefore give rise to fresh disturbances and excite the discontent and hatred of a section of the French people against the Church. In this description of the confiscation of the property of the Church Talleyrand, who had perhaps dictated the letter, showed an utter disregard for historical facts. Nobody knew better than he did that the spoliation of the Church had taken place at the dawn of the Revolution and before the nation had been called upon to make any great sacrifices; for he had proposed that measure in the *Assemblée Constituante* on October 10, 1789. The clergy were, indeed, willing to come to the assistance of their country, for Mgr. de Boisgelin, the Archbishop of Aix, offered in their name a loan of four hundred millions of livres to be raised by mortgage on their property. His offer was not even discussed, for the object of a powerful party in the Assembly was to ruin the clergy and deprive it of all influence and independence, in order to subject it more completely to the State.⁹ It was this act of plunder that Bernier, acting as the mouthpiece of Bonaparte and Talleyrand, now asked the Holy Father to recognize and ratify as the "fundamental condition of a reconciliation."¹⁰ He did not even allude to the promise made by the Assembly on November 2, 1789, and repudiated by the convention in September, 1794, that in return for the seizure of the property of the Church the nation would provide in a becoming manner for the expenses of public worship, for the support of the ministers of religion and for the relief of the poor; nor did he mention that the 17th Article of the "Rights of Man," voted by

⁷ Documents, N. 76, p. 113. Note de Bernier à Spina. Paris, 8 nov., 1800.

⁸ To obtain a legal title, French law requires an uninterrupted possession for at least ten years, and the Holy See and the French clergy had never ceased to protest against the spoliation. Chamard, *id.*, p. 104.

⁹ P. L. Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution Civile du Clergé*. Paris, 1872, t. II, p. 110. "La ruine absolve du clergé séculier et régulier semble être décidée dans cette Assemblée." Abbé Maury's Speech, October 13, 1789.

¹⁰ Documents, I, N. 80, p. 121. Bernier à Spina. Paris, 12 Nov., 1800. "Le bien de la paix, le repos de l'état, le rétablissement de la religion au milieu de nous, en un mot, la réunion de la France avec l'église de Rome, dépendent essentiellement de la conservation de ces acquisitions."

the Assembly in 1789, guaranteed an indemnity to every owner of a property seized by the State in the case of a public necessity.¹¹

Two more letters followed. In one Bernier repeated that the government would not make any concession with regard to the resignation of their sees by all the Bishops. In the other he asked that the clergy should be allowed to take the oaths of fidelity to the constitution of the year VIII.,¹² which some of the exiled Bishops had condemned, for it seemed to imply the approbation of laws contrary to religion, and many of the clergy had therefore refused to take it. In replying to Bernier, Mgr. Spina vainly implored of him to represent to the First Consul that the return of the Bishops to their sees could not be the cause of disturbances, since even though in exile they had never ceased to exhort their flocks by means of their vicars general to live in peace and to submit to the government. These Bishops had been driven from their dioceses by an atrocious persecution against the Catholic religion and its ministers. During their emigration they had suffered many misfortunes, and they had thereby merited the esteem and the veneration of all nations and the greatest consideration on the part of the Holy See. The Sovereign Pontiff could not issue to all the emigrant Bishops a general order to resign. No example of such a measure was to be found in the history of the Church. He could only exhort them to take that step; but if they refused to obey, and if the government of their sees were provided for in some other manner, to what troubles and calamities would not the Church of France be exposed?¹³

Mgr. Spina held out some hope that the Pope might consent to sacrifice so much of the property of the Church as had already been alienated, if that were the condition on which depended the reëstab-

¹¹ *Réimpression de Vancien Moniteur Universel*, t. II., p. 37. Séance du 10 Octobre, 1789. Talleyrand proposed that the nation should take over the entire property of the Church, including all tithes, and pay the clergy annually a sum equal to two-thirds of the revenues of these properties, which would amount to one hundred millions of livres (about twenty millions of dollars). A long discussion ensued, which was ended on November 2, when the Assembly, by 568 votes to 346, adopted Mirabeau's motion, which declared that all ecclesiastical property was placed at the disposal of the nation, on condition of providing in a becoming manner for the cost of public worship, the support of its ministers and the relief of the poor, under the supervision and according to the instructions of the provinces. The parish priests were to receive not less than twelve hundred livres a year, besides a house and garden. One of the first acts of the Convention after the death of Robespierre was to declare that the Republic would no longer pay the expenses or the salaries of the ministers of any religion. 18th September, 1794.

¹² The form of government then existing, which was established when Bonaparte had overthrown the Directory on the 18 Brumaire, an viii. (9th November, 1799).

¹³ Documents, I., N. 79, p. 17. Note de Spina à Bernier. Paris, 11 November, 1800.

lishment of Catholicism in France as the dominant religion. The French Government should, however, undertake to assure the subsistence not only of the Bishops, but also of the parish priests and of the subordinate clergy, and whatever had belonged to the Church and still remained unsold should be restored. As to the promise of fidelity to the constitution, Mgr. Spina declined to express any opinion, for though it had been condemned by the Pope, the decision of His Holiness had not yet been published; but he pointed out to Bernier that a promise of submission to the government would not give rise to the same scruples of conscience. Such a promise might be made by laymen, and the ministers of religion, who would naturally be filled with gratitude towards the First Consul, might very well be trusted to do their duty and be dispensed from making any promise.¹⁴

Bernier then drafted a plan for a Concordat in thirty-seven articles, in which the demands of the government were developed with more details. It was the first of several projects submitted to Mgr. Spina, who, while repeating that he was not authorized to sign any agreement, suggested various modifications which he thought that the Holy Father would probably require. A second draft was presented shortly after, drawn up apparently under the influence of Talleyrand,¹⁵ which offered less acceptable conditions than the first. According to that project the government would have been willing to declare that the Catholic religion was the religion of the State; that the new hierarchy should be composed of twelve Archbishops and fifty Bishops; that as much of the property of the Church as had not been sold should be used for the support of the clergy; that gifts might be accepted by the clergy for the endowment of churches, and that all laws, decrees and sentences which impeded the free exercise of the Catholic religion or the liberty of its ministers should be regarded as revolutionary and be repealed. In the revised project,¹⁶ presented to Mgr. Spina about December 24, the government merely acknowledged the fact that the great majority of the nation professed Roman Catholicism and promised to afford special protection to its public exercise, and that all the measures opposed to the freedom of its worship should be annulled. The number of the Archbishops was reduced to ten, and no allusion was made to the restitution of the unsold property of the Church or to the right to accept endowments. According to the first draft, the Bishops who should not be

¹⁴ Documents, III., Appendix A, No. 816, p. 607. *Nouvelles instructions pour Spina.* Rome, 13 Oct., 1800. *Id.*, Appendix B., No. 831, p. 650. *Note de Spina à Bernier.* Paris, 22 Nov., 1800.

¹⁵ Cardinal Mathieu, p. 114.

¹⁶ Documents, III., Appendix B, No. 838, p. 876. *Projet de Convention*, No. 11, vers le 24 Déc.

chosen to fill the new dioceses were to be ordered by the Holy Father to resign their sees for the good of peace and of religion; in the second draft the schismatic Bishops were put on the same level as those who had been canonically instituted and were to be exhorted by the Pope to relinquish sees to which they had no claim. A clause, too, was introduced to the effect that the ecclesiastics who had married should, "according to the ancient canons," be reduced to the condition of laymen. Mgr. Spina in his reply pointed out that the Holy Father could not ask the Bishops belonging to the constitutional clergy to resign their sees, as he did not recognize them, and they had therefore no jurisdiction. He also remarked that there existed no canons to reduce married priests to the state of laymen. The Holy Father would certainly be merciful to them, but that question was a matter of conscience and could not form the subject of a Concordat.

More favorable conditions were offered in the third draft, also the work of Bernier.¹⁷ The number of the Archbishops was again raised to twelve; the intrusive Bishops were not mentioned; the revenues of the ecclesiastical property not as yet alienated were to be distributed among the different churches and the dissensions which had arisen in France with regard to the constitutional clergy and those of its members who had married were to be appeased by a legate sent by the Sovereign Pontiff and provided with ample powers. There were still, however, some clauses which Mgr. Spina considered unacceptable, but the fourth project, which he received on January 11, had undergone very great modifications and showed still less of a conciliatory spirit than that which preceded it.¹⁸ The changes would seem to have been made in consequence of a letter addressed by Talleyrand to Bernier on January 12. The Minister, who affected to believe that the third project had been proposed, or at least accepted by Mgr. Spina, declared that the government refused to acknowledge any distinction between the constitutional clergy and the ancient clergy, and it wished to have the right to take the same interest in the former and show it the same consideration as the Holy Father manifested with regard to the latter. Mgr. Spina should therefore be informed that the government would listen to no proposals concerning the reëstablishment of a clergy in France until the observations it had just made were attended to. In this fourth draft the Catholic religion was, indeed, still recognized as that of the great majority of French citizens, but it was no longer

¹⁷ Documents, I., No. 178, p. 275. Spina à Consalvi. Parigi, 9 Gennaio, 1801. Documents, III., App. B, No. 842, p. 683. *Projet de Convention*, No. 111. Paris (vers le 4 Janvier, 1801).

¹⁸ Documents, I., No. 181, p. 279. *Projet de Convention*, No. IV. (14 Janvier, 1801).

declared to be the religion of the State, as in the first project, or that of the government, as in the third. Though the schismatic Bishops were not named, they were clearly indicated by the phrase, "*les titulaires quelconques des évêchés français*" (the titularies of the French bishoprics, whoever they may be) shall be requested by His Holiness to resign their sees in order to secure the complete and peaceful restoration of the Catholic religion in France. Nothing was said about the restitution of the church property not as yet alienated, and only government securities were allowed to be employed for the ecclesiastical endowments. Mgr. Spina had already assured Bernier at the beginning of the negotiations that he was not authorized to sign any convention, but so great was the abbé's anxiety to obtain his signature that he even drafted an answer such as he wished him to make, in which the Papal Envoy was made to reply that though he had not definite and absolute powers with regard to it, yet, as he felt certain that His Holiness would make every possible sacrifice in order to reunite France to the Holy See, he was ready to sign the project as soon as Bernier should be authorized to do so by his government.

Surprised at the unfavorable turn so unexpectedly given to the negotiations, Mgr. Spina could only remind Bernier that he had already frankly stated that he was not authorized by the Holy Father to sign any Concordat, but simply to inform the government of his intentions,¹⁹ and that as there were several articles in the project of which the Pope had not been made aware, it would be much more satisfactory to forward the document to him at once for his decision. Talleyrand was, of course, well aware of the fact, but he now asserted in a letter to Bernier that Mgr. Spina's refusal to ratify the project was quite unexpected; that the government of the republic had not foreseen that the object of the Archbishop's mission was only to inform the Pope with regard to its opinions. If Mgr. Spina persisted in his resolution, the government would have reason to believe that the Court of Rome had merely aimed at deceiving France for the purpose of keeping the States of the Church free from war;²⁰ but the refusal to sign had given them a timely warning of the real purpose of the mission, and Mgr. Spina might be told that his presence in Paris was no longer necessary.

Bernier when communicating this insolent message to Mgr. Spina had at least sufficient respect for the Holy See not to repeat Talleyrand's insinuations against the honor of the Papal Government. He still, however, sought to extort from the Papal Envoy, by persuasion

¹⁹ Documents, III., Appendix B, No. 834, p. 656. Spina à Bernier. Paris, 26 November, 1800.

²⁰ Documents, I., No. 190, p. 296. Talleyrand à Bernier. Paris, 21 Janvier, 1801.

or by threats, a signature which might bind the Sovereign Pontiff to a certain extent. The government knew, of course, so reasoned the abbé, that Mgr. Spina had not full powers, but had thought that it was only a question of definitive powers, and that even if he had been only authorized to hold conferences, he had thereby also the faculty of signing the result of those conferences, which the contracting powers would still have the right to sanction or to reject. Even if he were not expressly authorized to sign, could he not interpret the intentions of the Holy Father and take upon himself to do so in order to avoid an open rupture between the two States, which would be the inevitable consequence of his refusal? The government therefore demanded at once a definite answer, on which should depend whether the negotiations were to be continued or broken off.²¹

Mgr. Spina was well aware of the snare which had been laid for him and of the efforts which were made to hinder the conclusion of the Concordat. He wrote to Cardinal Consalvi: "To speak frankly, there is an intention of making war against religion, and every pretext to persecute it is sought for. I do not say that I utterly despair, but I much fear that no conclusion can be come to. . . . I know that the intrusive Bishop Grégoire is carrying on a bitter warfare against us, and he has inspired the First Consul with the utmost mistrust of the Court of Rome."²² In his reply to Bernier he assured him that it was impossible to give an immediate and decisive answer to all that was contained in his letter, but he hoped that he would not be refused what would be granted under similar conditions to the Minister of any other power—namely, to send at once a courier to Rome to demand further instructions and faculties. He therefore implored of Bernier, in the name of international law, in the name of religion, in the name of the Holy Father, to persuade the First Consul to grant him a short delay and to obtain a passport for his courier from the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Bonaparte willingly agreed to allow a courier to be sent to Rome and asked that he should leave as soon as possible, as he wished to end a negotiation which had already lasted too long. Instead of a passport, however, Mgr. Spina received, on January 29, a friendly note from Talleyrand stating that he, too, wished to forward some despatches and requesting him to put off the departure of his courier till the 31st, when he should receive his passport. Mgr. Spina courteously consented;²³ but Talleyrand, who was not so anxious as Bonaparte for the speedy

²¹ Documents, III., App. B, No. 846, p. 689. Note de Bernier à Spina. Paris, 22 Janvier, 1801.

²² Documents, I., No. 192, p. 300. Spina à Consalvi. Parigi, 22 Gennaio, 1801.

²³ Documents, III., No. 849, p. 693. Talleyrand à Spina. Paris, 29 Janvier, 1801.

conclusion of the Concordat, put off issuing the passport from day to day, in spite of the repeated applications of the Abbé Bernier and Mgr. Spina, and it was not until the 26th of February that the Papal courier left Paris. He was then, however, carrying a different set of despatches.

It is a very suspicious circumstance that at the time when these projects for a Concordat were being submitted to Mgr. Spina all communication between him and Cardinal Consalvi should have been interrupted. Between November 15, when Consalvi received Spina's letter from Lyons dated October 29, until January 10, when he got his letter dated December 20 and marked No. 10, he was without information as to what was taking place in Paris. As Spina's friends in Rome had received letters from him, the Cardinal, who had written to him every week, soon came to the conclusion that his own correspondence had been intercepted. By February 6, it is true, he had received the earlier letters and others up to No. 15, dated January 4, but too late to be able to give advice which might guide and enlighten the Archbishop in his struggle against such wily and unscrupulous adversaries as Grégoire and Talleyrand. Mgr. Spina on his side had received no letters from the Cardinal between November 11 and December 25, after which there seems to have been no further interruption to his correspondence. He did not, however, venture to send to Rome the various projects he had received from Bernier until, on February 14, while still waiting for a passport for his courier, he was able to entrust them to a messenger whom the Spanish Envoy, de Musquiz, was sending to Parma, whence they could be safely forwarded to their destination.²⁴

While the issue of the passport was still deferred Bonaparte and Talleyrand prepared another surprise for Mgr. Spina, and on February 21 they presented to him, unexpectedly, a fifth draft for a Concordat, which the First Consul had dictated and sent to the Minister on February 2.²⁵ Talleyrand had again the bad faith to state, as on a previous occasion in the letter which accompanied it, that this "project of convention," as Talleyrand always called the Concordat, had been given to him from the Papal Envoy,²⁶ whom he requested, as his instruction did not allow him to sign it, to express, at least, his approbation of it when forwarding it to the Holy Father. This new draft of a Concordat was also accompanied

²⁴ They reached Rome on February 27, where nothing was as yet known concerning the negotiations which had taken place. Documents, II., No. 292, p. 33. Consalvi à Spina. Roma, 28 febbraio, 1801.

²⁵ Documents, I., No. 222, p. 351. *Projet de Convention (No. V.) dicté par le Premier Consul. 2 février, 1801.*

²⁶ *Id.*, I., No. 264, p. 406. Talleyrand à Spina. Paris, 21 février, 1801. "J'ai l'honneur de vous adresser le projet de convention qui m'a été remis de votre part."

by that of a Bull in which it was to be inserted and which had been originally drawn up on December 3 by the Abbé Bernier. Mgr. Spina again prudently avoided either compromising the Holy Father by giving his approbation to this document or irritating Bonaparte by rejecting it. He replied to Talleyrand that he would make every effort to obtain from His Holiness that the wishes of the government should be satisfied, and that thus religious peace and harmony between the two States should be reëstablished; but in a letter to Cardinal Consalvi he observed that though he could not doubt the excellent intentions of the First Consul for the restoration of the Catholic religion in France, he could not ignore the fact that evil-minded persons were seeking every means to oppose them.²⁷

The passport, which had been so long delayed, was now at last issued, and the courier, Civio Palmoni, left Paris on February 26 and arrived in Rome on March 10, where the new draft produced a most painful impression,²⁸ as it showed less favorable dispositions towards the Catholic Church than those which had preceded it. The schismatic Bishops were still considered the equals of the legitimate titularies of their sees, and nothing was said about the special protection to be granted to the Catholic religion or the repeal of the laws which hindered the freedom of its exercise.²⁹ It is true that Bernier, in whom Bonaparte had full confidence, and who was well acquainted with his opinions, furnished Mgr. Spina with a document which indicated some slight variations in this fifth project, to which he thought that the First Consul might agree. His request that the source of the document should be kept secret, lest he should be compromised, would seem to show that Bonaparte was more willing than Talleyrand to make concessions, at least on matters of minor importance, provided the chief demands which he had stated on first opening the negotiations were granted, and that he thought it prudent to conceal the fact from Talleyrand.³⁰

That on which the First Consul most obstinately insisted and which it was most painful for the Holy Father to be obliged to concede was the resignation of their sees by all the Bishops of France. On this point Bonaparte was inflexible. He even told Mgr. Spina,

²⁷ Documents, II., No. 304, p. 53. Spina à Consalvi. Parigi, 25 Febbraio, 1801.

²⁸ Documents, II., No. 336, p. 139. Consalvi à Spina. Roma, 14 Marzo, 1801. "Può ella immaginare che il Progetto ministeriale trasmessomi ha fatto qui la più dolorosa impressione. Ecco il quinto progetto e sempre il tutto è più incarito del precedente."

²⁹ Documents, I., No. 222, p. 352. *Projet de Convention* (No. V.) dicté par la Premier Consul (3 Février, 1801). "Les titulaires actuels, à quelque titre que ce soit, des évêchés français, seront invités par Sa Sainteté à se démettre."

³⁰ Documents, II., No. 305, p. 58. Variantes du *Projet V.* indiquées confidentiellement par Bernier comme admissibles. Paris, 25 février, 1801.

who remonstrated with him on the subject, that if the Pope did not carry out his views "he would adopt another sect and would overthrow religion in France, in Italy and even in Rome." In rendering an account of the interview Mgr. Spina expressed his belief that the object of the speech was merely to intimidate, but he added that there was reason to fear everything.³¹

The fifth draft of the Concordat was the first which was officially submitted to the Pope,³² and for the purpose of studying it and drawing up an answer two boards or "congregations" of Cardinals were appointed. The smaller, composed of Cardinals Antonelli, Gerdil and Carandini, with Mgr. di Pietro, Patriarch of Jerusalem, as secretary, was to prepare the plan of a Concordat, following as much as possible the lines of the French original. The larger congregation, of which the same three Cardinals formed part, together with Cardinals Albani, the dean of the Sacred College; Caraffa, Lorenzana, Doria, Borgia, Roverella, Somaglia, Braschi and Consalvi, with Mgr. di Pietro also as secretary, was then to examine and approve this plan and the final decision in the matter was reserved to the Holy Father, who presided over their deliberations. The French Government had so frequently and emphatically pointed out the necessity of observing absolute secrecy during the discussion of the Concordat, as the smallest indiscretion with regard to it would produce the most fatal and incalculable results, that the Holy Father imposed on the Cardinals forming the congregations what is known as the "secrecy of the Holy Office" (*il segreto del Santo Ufficio*). They were not even allowed to consult their theologians.

The smaller congregation ended its preparatory work on March 28, the eve of Palm Sunday. The larger congregation held its first meeting at the Quirinal on April 7, and Cardinal Consalvi hoped that in ten or twelve days the draft of the Concordat, corrected according to the opinions of the Cardinals, together with a letter from the Holy Father to Bonaparte and a memorandum explaining the reasons for making the changes, might be forwarded to Paris. An unexpected delay, however, for which neither the Pope nor the Cardinals could be held responsible, very nearly caused the negotiations to be broken off. In his impatience to have the Concordat signed as quickly as possible the First Consul resolved to send to Rome François Cacault, a diplomatist who had assisted him to draw

³¹ Documents, II., No. 306, p. 63. Spina à Consalvi. Parigi, 25 febbraio, 1801. "Il Primo Console ripette ciò che quì apertamente detto avera me nella prima udienza, cioè che se Nostro Signore non secondava in ciò le sue intenzioni, avrebbe adottata un'altra setta, ed avrebbe rovesciata la religione in Francia, in Italia, e perfino in Roma."

³² Cardinal Mathieu, p. 123.

up the Treaty of Tolentino and had then represented France in Rome until he was succeeded by Joseph Bonaparte, towards the end of 1797. According to Bonaparte's message to Talleyrand, Cacault was to be empowered to discuss both the spiritual and the temporal affairs of the republic, and he was to sign the Concordat in Rome.³³ The instructions which Talleyrand gave to the Envoy, and which if not dictated by Bonaparte were at least approved by him, were that he should seek to renew the friendly relations which had formerly existed between France and the Court of Rome. "France had abandoned the idea of making Rome a republic. . . . Two years of disturbances and crime had shown the folly of the attempt, and the present government, leaving the blame of that policy to those who had originated it and who in spite of every obstacle obstinately persisted in making it be adopted, had yielded to the desires of Italy and to the complaints of the principal powers of Europe and had consented to the reëstablishment of the Sovereign Pontiff." The instructions then pointed out that from a political point of view the Holy See required constant protection, which it could only obtain by having recourse to a government which had no interest to serve by oppressing it. France, by her position, her moderation and the care which she has always shown to maintain an equilibrium in Italy, is the power on which the Court of Rome has at all times reckoned with most confidence. The presence of Austria at Venice and of an independent republic in the centre of Italy render that support more necessary. The Holy See has it in its power to repay by its moral influence the debt imposed on it by its weakness. Venerated by the people and arbitrating in the disputes between ministers of religion, the Sovereign Pontiff can oblige them to observe social concord and political obedience. The government of the republic had been enlightened on that point by ten years of most fatal experience. It had been convinced by the rapidity and the extent of the insurrection of the West that the attachment of the great mass of the French people to its religious ideas was not a vain fancy, and it had understood that out of that sentiment there arose interests and rights that political institutions ought to respect. The present government, therefore, has granted measures of indulgence and toleration which have strengthened its power. It wishes to give to the system which it has adopted a character of permanency and publicity which should leave no doubt as to the purity and sincerity of its intentions; it wishes to put an end to religious discussions, and it acknowledges that the only means of attaining that object is to reëstablish between the republic and the Holy See the

³³ Documents, II., No. 349, p. 182. Consalvi aux membres de la Grande Congregation, 31 Marzo.

religious and the political bonds which formerly united France and the Court of Rome.

In spite, however, of this confession of the errors of the Revolution, which were adroitly put down to the account of the Directory which Bonaparte had overthrown, Cacaull was also instructed to declare to the ministers of Pius VII. that the government of the republic would not consent to any change in the articles of the project which it had approved. It professed, indeed, "to be willing to restore to religion its lost rights," and to "give a social existence to Catholicism," which it would "defend against the attacks which a too distrustful liberty might feel inclined to make upon it." But to preserve social concord" and "prevent the friends of religion from rising up against the principles of liberty and abandoning its "Catholicism must keep within its prescribed bounds; it must repay to the State what it owes for the protection it receives; it must help cause."³⁴ In other words, General Bonaparte had perceived that the Revolution had made a grievous mistake; it had thought that it could abolish the Holy See and destroy the Catholic Church, and that society could exist without any form of religion. It had merely succeeded in provoking a civil war and deluging France with blood. He was, therefore, willing to grant the Church a certain amount of liberty and influence, but only on condition that the clergy consented to be very submissive and very grateful to him and to employ their authority to enforce obedience to his government.

By the middle of April the congregation of twelve Cardinals had drafted a Concordat which agreed substantially with the French original. The Pope accepted gratefully the declaration of the French Government that the Catholic religion was that of the great majority of French citizens, but a clause was introduced binding the government to adopt it and protect it, in spite of any law or decree contrary to the purity of its dogmas or the free exercise of its discipline. The articles which followed granted the principal demands which had been made. There was to be a new delimitation of the sees; the present titularies were to be asked to resign; the right of nomination to the bishoprics was granted to the First Consul, professing the Catholic religion; the oath of fidelity to the government was to be taken before him, and prayers for the republic were to be said in church. An Apostolic Delegate would dispense the purchasers of church property from restitution, and the government

³⁴ Documents, I., No. 221, p. 350. *Le Premier Consul à Talleyrand. Paris, 2 Février, 1801.* "Il sera chargé de discuter cette Convention et en même temps les intérêts temporels de la République. . . . Il serait porteur d'un double plein pouvoir: un pour le spirituel, l'autre pour le temporel. La Convention serait signé à Rome par lui et un individu désigné par le Pape."

would provide for the support of the clergy. The Delegate was to have the same powers with regard to the married clergy as were granted by Julius III. to Cardinal Pole; the government was to possess the same rights and privileges as had been enjoyed by the Kings of France and recognized by the Holy See before the Revolution.

Cacault had been instructed to protest against any modifications which might be introduced into the draft of the Concordat drawn up by the First Consul. When, therefore, he was shown on April 28 the Concordat and the Bull ready to be sent to Paris, he made several objections to the changes which the congregation of Cardinals had considered it to be its duty to make.³⁵ Before the fifth draft had been sent to Rome the words "submission to the laws" had been inserted in the form of the oath in the place of "fidelity and obedience to the government," as Bonaparte had originally written.³⁶ The Cardinals had merely restored the primitive text, but this displeased Cacault, as well as the omission of the words specifying that the parish priests named by the Bishops should be approved by the government. He blamed also the nomination of a legate for the purpose of giving absolution to the purchasers of church property, found fault with some minor details and insisted most obstinately on retaining the identical forms of the official draft.³⁷ Cardinal Consalvi foresaw that the result of allowing Cacault to criticize the changes made in the text sent from Paris would be that instead of ensuring that the Concordat accompanied by a letter from the Pope and a memorandum containing the reasons assigned for making the changes should reach the First Consul all at the same time, and thus produce a good impression on him, he would probably be unfavorably influenced before receiving them by the opinions and comments forwarded by Cacault.³⁸ It would, however, have been imprudent to offend the republican Envoy by refusing his request, and so great was the anxiety of the Holy Father to conclude the Concordat as speedily as possible that within two days three meetings of the congregation of Cardinals were held, in order to ascertain if it might not be possible to make further concessions. Cacault had, indeed, the honesty to inform Talleyrand that to his objections, which had obliged the Cardinals to recommence their labors, was owing the delay in the despatch of

³⁵ Documents, II., No. 324, p. 103. Instructions pour Cacault. Paris, 19 Mars, 1801.

³⁶ Documents, II., No. 369, p. 210. Contre-projet amendé d'après les votes de la grande Congrégation. Rome, vers le 17 avril, 1801.

³⁷ Documents, II., No. 392, p. 255. Cacault à Talleyrand. Rome, 2 Mai, 1801.

³⁸ Documents, I., No. 267, p. 409. Note de Bernier à Spina, 25 février, 1801.

the Concordat and of the other documents, which should otherwise have already reached Paris. But Bonaparte was so much irritated that the negotiations were nearly brought to an abrupt termination.³⁹

Cardinal Consalvi's fears with regard not only to the delay, but also to the mischief which might result from Cacault's interference, were soon realized. When the congregation began to revise the draft of the Concordat the Cardinal made an agreement with Cacault that no information should be sent to Paris concerning the difficulties which had arisen from Cacault's insistence on the "use of expressions, phrases and forms quite contrary to the laws of the Church."⁴⁰

The Cardinal's object in acting thus was: "1. To avoid causing the French Government any uneasiness with regard to any particular article before the entire document became known. 2. Because by subjecting it to a fresh revision, many difficulties might be eliminated. And this, in fact, took place owing to the great desire of His Holiness to go as far as the furthest limits of his Apostolic powers."⁴¹ The Cardinal faithfully observed his promise and wrote nothing about the matter to Mgr. Spina; but Cacault broke his word and sent his government a full relation of what was taking place. His report was not even strictly accurate. The Concordat had been read to him only once, and he had evidently misunderstood what he had heard, for he stated that the Holy Father demanded that the First Consul should forward to him a list of the Bishops whom he did not wish to nominate to the new sees about to be formed, together with his reasons for wishing to exclude them.⁴² The fact that changes were being made in the very article of the Concordat to which he attached most importance—namely, that touching upon the resignation of the Bishops—was enough to irritate Bonaparte and make him suspect that foreign nations or the Bourbon princes were intriguing to prevent the execution of the Concordat. Mgr. Spina only knew that Cacault had found fault with the draft prepared by the Papal Government, and could give him no information on the subject. The Papal Envoy, who in every letter to Consalvi implored of him to send back his courier at once with the documents, lived in daily expectation of some outburst of

³⁹ Documents, II., No. 381, p. 241. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 24 Aprile, 1801. "Non gli basta che nella sostanza si accordi tutto, ma è ostinatissimo ancora nelle precise forme del progetto ufficiale."

⁴⁰ *Id.*, II., No. 368, p. 209. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 15 Aprile, 1801.

⁴¹ *Id.*, No. 392, p. 255. Cacault à Talleyrand, Rome, 2 Mai, 1801. "Le courier du Pape serait parti, et vous auriez avant cette lettre la bulle, la bref et le Concordat, si mes objections n'avaient obligé à recommencer ce travail."

⁴² *Id.*, II., No. 494, p. 650. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 23 maggio, 1801. "Egli volle saper tutto, e formò nuove questioni sopra di tutto. Bisognò fargli conoscere l'impossibilità delle sue pretensioni, ostinandosi a volere espressioni e frasi, affatto contrarie alle leggi della Chiesa."

anger on the part of the First Consul when the negotiations would be broken off and never again renewed.⁴³

He did not wait long. On May 12 Mgr. Spina was requested by Talleyrand to appear at once, along with Bernier, at *la Malmaison*, the First Consul's country house, near Paris. Bonaparte received him courteously, but expressed with much energy his dissatisfaction with the Court of Rome for its slowness in returning an answer to his project for a Concordat and for having made changes in it. He was convinced that this delay and the refusal to grant his demands were caused by the intrigues of the non-Catholic powers, Russia, Prussia and England, and that the Holy See made the negotiations drag on slowly with the hope that some change might take place in the state of political affairs. He therefore requested Mgr. Spina to inform the Pope that he would be very glad to restore the Catholic religion in France and to show him the utmost respect, if only the Holy Father would grant him what he wanted and place full confidence in him. Otherwise he was certain that if he gave back to the people any sort of public worship, together with their church bells and their processions and reëstablished the Pragmatic Sanction, he could, without meeting with any opposition, set up a religion of some sort independently of the Pope, and that then all regard for the Holy See would at once come to an end.⁴⁴

Bernier was charged by the First Consul to write to Cardinal Consalvi in the name of the French Government on the same subject. His letter was in the same menacing tone. He informed the Cardinal that any further delay would be attributed to him personally; it would be considered as a flagrant rupture of the peace, and the French troops would at once occupy the States of the Church as a conquered territory. Bonaparte certainly declared that France could not exist without a religion; that he wished for one, and that he preferred the Catholic religion, in which he was born and in which he wished to die. He promised to afford it special protection, to profess it openly and to assist in state at its ceremonies. As it was the religion of the great majority of French citizens, it would be the predominant religion, but he did not wish to employ those words, as they would produce a very bad effect upon certain minds.

⁴³ Documents, II., No. 503, p. 461. Consalvi à Bernier, Rome, 30 Mai, 1801. Documents, II., No. 504, p. 463. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 30 Maggio.

⁴⁴ Documents, II., No. 386, p. 247. Cacault à Talleyrand, Rome, 26 avril, 1801. Documents, II., No. 489, p. 438. Consalvi à Bernier, Rome, 21 Mai, 1801. "Nous étions convenus ensemble que ni l'un ni l'autre aurait rien écrit, pour ne pas donner des inquiétudes et laisser la chose dans son ensemble. Je tins avec scrupule ma parole. . . . M. Cacault a jugé de faire autrement. . . . Au moins, eût il référé la chose telle qu'elle était; mais sans mauvaise volonté, il a oublié ou changé, par mévue, bien des choses."

Bernier repeated the First Consul's threat that if his views did not suit the Holy See he would adopt some sort of religion and make it be accepted wherever the influence of France extended; and he wound up by a rapid sketch of the reasons against making any further delay in concluding the Concordat: "France is calling out for her religion; Italy wishes to preserve that which she has, and Germany desires to protect her own. The States of the Church are asking for relief; the Sovereign Pontiff hopes for an increase of territory; the French priests languishing in exile wish to return to their country. All that can be brought about by the decision of the Holy See, and yet it comes not! How many souls might have been saved, how many evils might have been avoided, how much good accomplished if there had been more speed!"⁴⁵

Then the abbé, quite pleased with himself, sent to Talleyrand a copy of his letter, which the ex-Bishop was asked to show to Bonaparte in order that they might "see in the sincerity of his expressions, the purity of his zeal and how much he desired to put an end to the anxiety they experienced." He also expressed the hope that "Cardinal Consalvi would abjure his pretended cunning or his laziness and give them without delay what they wanted, as, if he did not, the First Consul would seek to save religion by other measures."⁴⁶

The Papal courier left Rome on May 13, bearing the draft of the Concordat in Latin and French, along with a memorandum which explained why the Holy Father had been unable to accept all the articles of the French project and justifying the changes which had been made. In a letter to Bonaparte, which accompanied these documents, the Holy Father expressed the joy which he had felt on being invited to enter into a negotiation for the reëstablishment of the Catholic religion in France. He regretted, however, that since the Catholic religion had been declared to be the religion of the great majority of French citizens, it should not have been completely restored to its former rank as the predominant religion and to the enjoyment of all its rights and privileges. Great also was his sorrow on finding himself obliged to ask all the Bishops of France to give in their resignations. Was it not painful for the Head of the Church to have to expel from their sees such a number of prelates so distinguished by their virtues, by their misfortunes and by their constancy in defending religion when it was assailed by a most cruel persecution? Whatever might have been their political principles in the past, he felt certain that if, by the benevolence of the First

⁴⁵ Documents, II., No. 455, p. 384. Spina à Consalvi, Parigi, 5 Maggio, 1801. "Mi aspetto di giorno in giorno qualche scappata consolare, e se si rompe, non ci attacchiamo più."

⁴⁶ Documents, II., No. 463, p. 394. Spina à Consalvi, Parigi, 12 Maggio, 1801.

Consul, they were restored to their flocks, they would teach them that obedience was their first duty, and their recall would contribute to maintain peace, while their resignation might disturb it. The Holy Father then implored Bonaparte to recall at least as many of the Bishops as would be required for the newly formed dioceses and to provide for the support of those who should not be chosen. He also asked him to allow the reëstablishment of seminaries and chapters, of convents and monasteries, and that the clergy might be authorized to accept and to own real property. The Pope then concluded by protesting that he had granted as much as his conscience would allow him to grant, and that if by his concessions he were to sanction maxims condemned by the Catholic religion, it is not that religion which would be reëstablished in France, but something totally different from it.⁴⁷

Two drafts of the Concordat were forwarded to Mgr. Spina. The one to be presented to the government, which it was hoped would be accepted, was distinguished by a small dot on the first page from the other, bearing two dots, in which some of the expressions were slightly varied. This latter Mgr. Spina was to keep, as in case of further discussion it would enable him to make some slight concessions. There was even a third version of some of the articles marked with three dots, which could be made use of as a last resource.⁴⁸ Before, however, the courier reached Paris the First Consul, irritated not only by the long delay, which, as he must have known, was caused by the objections of his own Envoy meddling in a question which he did not understand, and also at not having received any communication on the subject from Cardinal Consalvi, who was bound by his promise not to mention the discussion which was taking place, sent an *ultimatum* to the Holy See. Cacaault was instructed to inform the Pope: 1. That the French Government refused to allow any modification of the substance or the form of the project of convention or of the Bull in which it was to be inserted which had been presented to His Holiness to be accepted. 2. If the Holy Father did not, within five days, accept the said projects without modification, the Envoy's presence in Rome would be of no further use for the principal object of his mission, and he was to withdraw to Florence. 3. If in the above mentioned delay the two projects are adopted without any modification, the two States should be united by peaceful relations. The publicity of these relations would be then honorably declared by the proclamation of the articles agreed upon and inserted in the definitive draft of the Bull of the Holy Father.

⁴⁷ Documents, II, No. 465, p. 401. Bernier à Consalvi, Paris, 13 Mai, 1801.

⁴⁸ *Id.*, No. 466, p. 404. Bernier à Talleyrand, Paris, 13 Mai, 1801.

In the letter which conveyed these instructions to Cacault Talleyrand criticized the Papal Government in the disdainful and menacing tone he usually employed with regard to the Holy See. He accused the Court of Rome of trifling with France and disputing about frivolous accessories when the question of its existence as a temporal power was not as yet even decided. The Holy Father and his ministers should be convinced of these two facts: "1. That theological matters were understood as well in Paris as in Rome, and that persons as distinguished by their knowledge of these subjects (meaning thereby, probably, himself, his secretary, de Hauterive, and Grégoire) as any of His Holiness' advisers had found that neither religion nor its dogmas, its maxims or its discipline would be exposed to any change by the conditions imposed on the Holy See in the articles agreed upon. 2. The government of the republic was firmly resolved either to obtain completely and promptly what it wanted or to break off definitively all negotiations on matters which it had discussed with frankness, with generosity, with the most liberal justice, while the Court of Rome had haggled and shown malevolence and dissimulation." Talleyrand had even the incredible effrontery to accuse the Court of Rome of responding with ingratitude to the efforts made by the government of the republic "to stop it on the edge of the precipice and to restore, if possible, the progressive course of the decadence of its power." He also suggested that the validity of the election of Pius VII. might be questioned. It had been held under the direct influence of a single power, and required to be acknowledged by all the nations interested in its legality; it had not been held in the accustomed place, and the proceedings and formalities which accompanied it had not, perhaps, endowed it with sufficient authenticity. "Was it prudent, therefore, when in this situation to criticize a mode of political and religious reconciliation with the most powerful government in Europe and with the most numerous nation in Catholic Christianity?"⁴⁹

The Abbé Bernier, too, though he must have known that the intervention of Cacault in a matter which he did not understand was much more likely to have caused a delay than any ill-will on the part of Consalvi, apparently thought it his duty to again upbraid the Cardinal, as if he alone were responsible for all that had occurred. He repeated the terms of the *ultimatum* and pointed out that it was the fatal consequence of the Cardinal's indecision and of his hesitating to restore to the most powerful people in Europe the only boon it desired. "Alas! why have you waited until requests were followed by threats? Did not our prayers, our wishes, our tears suffice?"

⁴⁹ Documents, II., No. 402, p. 289. Le Pape au Premier Consul, Rome, 12 Mai, 1801.

Were not two months enough to study the project? They have passed away, and nothing is to be seen; there is nothing to satisfy the impatient ardor of a people hungering for its religion. . . . Send this Bull, this Concordat, so long desired. There is no other means to preserve the religion of our fathers in France and Italy, the temporal power of the Holy See in Rome, the ecclesiastical electorates in Germany and, perhaps, peace in the greater part of the Continent of Europe."⁵⁰ Proud of his eloquence, the abbé again furnished Talleyrand with a copy of his letter, to be shown to Bonaparte, remarking: "Your letter was crushing (*foudroyante*). To the strong impression which it cannot fail to produce I add, in mine, the language of persuasion. May they be frightened by one and touched by the other, so as to send us at once what we want." And he assured the Minister that he might always reckon on the activity of his zeal.⁵¹

In spite, however, of the anxiety shown by Bernier to merit the favor of the First Consul and of Talleyrand, Mgr. Spina seems to have been under the impression that he owed much to him. It was by his means that he sought to counteract the efforts made to irritate Bonaparte against the Catholics, and he was convinced that the abbé had done all he could to calm the general and to persuade him to wait for the result of the negotiations before taking any violent measures.

As Cardinal Consalvi had sent off the Concordat on the day that the first of these threatening letters was written, he was at last free to explain that the delay of so many days in the departure of the courier had been caused by the objections raised by Cacault and by the revision of their work by the Cardinals for the purpose of satisfying him. He was also able to account for his silence by mentioning the compact made with Cacault, which he had scrupulously observed, while Cacault had not, but it was then too late, and the *ultimatum* was already on its way. When it arrived in Rome, on May 28, Cardinal Consalvi had been since some days confined to his bed with fever, and in that condition had to give audience to Cacault. His grief on being informed of Cacault's approaching departure was very great, because "so much thought, so much toil, so much anxiety had been scattered to the winds," and because the negotiations were broken off "after everything had been substantially granted, and under forms in which there was nothing opposed to the actual state of affairs in France."⁵² The Holy Father was not less pained on finding that not only all his efforts to satisfy the demands

⁵⁰ *Id.*, No. 400, p. 268 and p. 274.

⁵¹ Documents, II., No. 479, p. 419. Talleyrand à Cacault, Paris, 19 Mai, 1801.

⁵² *Id.*, No. 478, p. 422. Bernier à Consalvi, Paris, 19 Mai, 1801.

of the French Government had proved useless, but also that the probity and the good faith of the Holy See was doubted, and that it was supposed that the intrigues of foreign powers had influenced his decisions.

On receiving the *ultimatum* Pius VII. again convoked the congregation of the twelve Cardinals who had prepared the draft Concordat, and they agreed with him that he could not have signed the documents sent from Paris without in some way modifying them. It was in vain that Cacault in a long interview sought to reopen the question. The Holy Father assured him that neither Russia nor England had even attempted to interfere in the discussion of the Concordat, so profound was the secrecy with which the proceedings had been conducted, and he declared to him that no temporal considerations could induce him to speak otherwise than he was bound to do by the dogmas of the Church. Cacault tried to persuade the Holy Father that he had the power to grant everything demanded by France; that the power to bind and loose had no limits when great evils were to be prevented. The Pope remained unshaken in his resolution.⁵³

Cacault's orders to leave Rome within five days were peremptory and did not allow him to yield to the Holy Father's supplications that he should wait until he had heard from Paris how the Roman draft of the Concordat had been received. It might have given satisfaction, in which case the dangers which appeared to threaten Rome from all sides would be averted. Everything, indeed, seemed to portend an approaching invasion of Rome and the proclamation of another republic. The numbers of the French troops in Tuscany had been greatly augmented. It was rumored that ten thousand of them were about to march on Rome, where many French officers were arriving every day under various pretexts, and the revolutionary party in the Papal States was displaying much activity and proclaiming that "the fruit was ripe."⁵⁴

In this critical situation, when it seemed that the inevitable result of a rupture with France would be the downfall of the Papal Government, Cacault happily perceived a way to conciliate his obedience to the orders of the First Consul with the sympathy and the respect which he felt for Pius VII. He knew that Bonaparte sincerely desired to bring about a reconciliation between France and the Holy See; that such had always been his idea, and that it would one day

⁵³ Documents, II., No. 479, p. 424. Bernier à Talleyrand, Paris, 20 Mai, 1801.

⁵⁴ *Id.*, II., No. 504, p. 462. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 30 Maggio, 1801. "Tanti pensieri, tante fatiche, tante cure tutte gettate al vento, Ecco! ad una rottura. E come? Dopo aver tutto accordato in fondo, dopo aver combinato i modi che in mella repugnassero alle attuali circostanze della Francia."

be accomplished. He knew, also, that "the Ministers who surrounded him did not desire it, and that the temperament which it is most easy to irritate and to deceive is that of a soldier who has not yet learned to understand politics and who always comes back to the word of command and to his sword."⁵⁵ He thought, therefore, that he would be acting quite in accordance with Bonaparte's views if he were to persuade the Pope to send Cardinal Consalvi to Paris to explain everything and to seek to bring the matter to an end.⁵⁶

The suggestion was gladly accepted by the Holy Father and by Cardinal Consalvi, as it held out to them a chance of escaping from the disasters which seemed about to overwhelm the State. A Consistory of the whole Sacred College was immediately assembled, and when the Pope had fully exposed the question at issue the Cardinals declared unanimously that the Holy Father could not have signed the Concordat which had been presented to him without introducing some modifications, and they approved of his sending Consalvi to Paris. In order to prove as publicly as possible that no rupture had taken place between the Holy See and France, and thus prevent the revolutionary party from taking advantage of the departure of the French Minister to provoke disturbances, it was agreed, also on Cacault's suggestion,⁵⁷ that both the Cardinal and he should travel together, and on the morning of Saturday, June 6, Consalvi left the Quirinal, and, taking Cacault in his carriage, drove with him out of Rome on the road to Florence.

At Florence Cardinal Consalvi was received by General Murat, the Commander-in-Chief of the French army in Italy, with the honors due to his rank and the mission with which he was charged. He had also the satisfaction of being able to inform Cardinal Giuseppe Doria, who had taken his place as Secretary of State,⁵⁸ that the general had assured him that he had no orders to make his troops advance or to treat the Papal States as hostile territory. Cacault then took up his residence in Florence, while the Cardinal continued his journey towards Paris, which he reached on the night of June 20, and where long and arduous labors still awaited him before the Concordat was concluded.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

⁵⁵ Documents, II., No. 511, p. 477. Cacault à Talleyrand, Rome, 3 Juin, 1801. "Je ne l'ai pas seulement ébranlé."

⁵⁶ *Id.*, No. 490, p. 441. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 21 Maggio, 1801. *Id.*, No. 501, p. 457. Ghislieri à Colloredo, Rome, 30 Mai. *Id.*, No. 505, p. 505. Consalvi à Spina, Roma, 30 Maggio, 1801. "Le voci dei patriotti sono qui e nello Stato univoche che il frutto è maturo."

⁵⁷ A. F. Artand de Montor, *Histoire du Pape Pie VII.* Paris, 1836, t. I., p. 122.

⁵⁸ Documents, VI., No. 522 ter, p. 45. Consalvi à Doria. Firenze, 8 Maggio, 1801.

POPE ADRIAN IV.

ONCE only in the history of the world has an Englishman been raised to the highest dignity on earth—the Papal throne—and that was so long ago that his countrymen have almost forgotten the fact; perhaps, during the last three hundred and fifty years, when the very name of Pope has been a red rag to the Protestant English nation, they have wished to forget it. Yet Adrian IV. was as a man so talented, so devout, so good, and as Pope so excellent that he deserves to be remembered with pride and admiration by all Englishmen, especially as many of his good qualities were, as we hope to show, so essentially English.

Nicholas Breakspear, the story of whose life is more like romance than history, was born about the year 1100. He was the son of a poor married priest, who afterwards became a monk in the great Abbey of St. Albans, in Hertfordshire. There seems to be no doubt that Robert Breakspear, the future Pope's father, was married, and it is certain that in his wife's lifetime, and when Nicholas was a little boy, he became a monk. The probability is that Robert Breakspear was one of those married priests against whom St. Anselm, then Archbishop of Canterbury, took stringent measures to restore the primitive discipline. The abuse of the marriage of priests had crept into the Church, and in 1102 he passed a decree at a synod at Westminster forbidding priests to marry. It is about this time that Robert Breakspear became a monk, though it was not till 1120, at the first Lateran Council, that the marriage of priests was declared invalid. Robert Breakspear on hearing of St. Anselm's decree prohibiting the marriage of priests may perhaps have repented of having been guilty of this breach of ecclesiastical discipline and put away his wife and taken the monastic vows as a son of St. Benedict in the Abbey of St. Albans. Very little is known of Nicholas' family, which appears to have been of respectable but humble origin, though some attempt has been made to prove that Breakspear was only the name of the birthplace of Nicholas, and that his father was really one Robert de Camera, of Norman birth, but there seems to be little evidence to support this theory, based rather on a wish to claim Norman descent for the future Pope than on facts. His mother was alive and in great poverty when Nicholas had risen to the Chair of Peter, for he was appealed to to relieve her and refused to use the Papal revenues for that purpose, but referred her case to the Court of Canterbury. Nicholas had certainly one brother, but we hear of no more than this one, whose son, Boso Breakspear, became his uncle's secretary and biographer and ultimately a Cardinal.

If the above theory of Robert Breakspear's life be true, it would account for his leaving his wife and family in poverty while he became a monk, instead of maintaining them, but it does not justify his subsequent harsh treatment of his little son, whom he drove away from the monastery, where he came daily for food and education, because he was ashamed of him.

It is said that before Nicholas was turned out of the monastery by his father he went to the abbot and asked to be received as a postulant, but Abbot Robert on examining him found him very ignorant and refused his petition, telling him he must study more before he could become a monk. Years after this, when the good abbot visited Adrian IV. at Benevento, the Pope received him most kindly and laughingly reminded him of his rejection of the unpromising aspirant to monastic life. Nicholas is described as a pretty boy of charming manners. He retained both his comeliness and his charm of address and grew up to be a handsome man of graceful carriage and courteous bearing. Indeed, his personality seems to have been very fascinating and to have won him not only popularity, but what he valued more—the friendship of a man like John of Salisbury, a great scholar and chronicler, his lifelong, faithful friend, and the devotion of his nephew, Cardinal Boso, his most important biographer.

Nicholas appears to have been a mere lad of fourteen when his father turned him adrift. He started at once begging his way, as many other poor scholars in those times did, till he finally arrived at Arles, in Provence, in the south of France. Living as he did about fifty years after the Norman Conquest, he was probably familiar with the French language; indeed, we know that he became in course of time an excellent linguist as well as a good classical scholar, and his knowledge of the French language may have facilitated his travels in France. He must have been a boy of no mean courage to have walked alone, in those rough times from St. Albans to the coast, whence he probably worked his passage across the Channel, and then to have tramped quite across the whole length of France in days when roads were few and robbers many.

We next find him entering the monastery of canons regular of St. Rufus as a lay Brother. His biographers are not quite agreed as to the exact situation of this monastery. Some place it at Avignon, others near Valence. Mr. Mackie,¹ the most modern authority on the subject, says it was certainly at or near Avignon and was afterwards moved to Valence. In this monastery he made such progress in his studies, and was so much liked for his personal beauty and charming manner, as well as for his prompt obedience and his

¹ Pope Adrian IV., *The Lothian Essay*, by T. D. Mackie, Oxford.

wisdom, that they raised him to the priesthood and made him a canon regular, and after some years he was so admired and esteemed for his learning, as well as for his eloquence, for he was a very fine preacher, that they elected him abbot. Then occurred an event not by any means unique in monastic history—the new abbot proved stricter than the canons liked, and partly on this account, partly because he was a foreigner, they revolted against him and took their cause to Rome.

Eugenius III., of saintly memory, was Pope at the time, and he made peace between the abbot and his unruly subjects, but at the end of a year the canons again rebelled, and when they and their abbot appeared a second time in Rome Eugenius sternly rebuked the monks and told them they were not worthy of such an abbot and sent them back to their monastery and retained Nicholas in Rome, where he was soon after made Cardinal Bishop of Albano. This was in the year 1146, and before we follow the fortunes of the future Pope any further it may be as well to take a glance at some of his contemporaries.

King Stephen was ruling in England, Theobald was Archbishop of Canterbury, Eugenius III. was occupying the Papal throne in troublous times, St. Bernard was preaching the second Crusade, Arnold of Brescia was stirring up rebellion in Europe by his heretical teaching, Conrad III. was Emperor of Germany, Louis VI., surnamed the Young, was King of France. One of the principal aims of St. Bernard and the Pope was to draw foreign countries into closer relationship with the Holy See, and for this purpose Cardinal Paparo was sent to Ireland and Cardinal Breakspear to Scandinavia on the same mission in 1152. Nicholas traveled through England on his way to Norway, and strange must have been the great Cardinal's feelings, traveling now in state and luxury with his suite over the same roads he had traveled, probably barefoot, begging his way, when he started on his search for fortune so many years ago. Then he was a poor, pretty, friendless, ignorant boy of fourteen or fifteen; now he was a great dignitary of the Church, a handsome man of fifty, a fine orator and preacher, a good linguist and a great diplomatist. It reads more like romance than history, and is only one more proof of the veracity of the hackneyed old saying that "truth is stranger than fiction."

Space does not allow us to dwell on his mission to Scandinavia; suffice it to say that it was an eminent success. The Cardinal settled the disputes that were raging in Norway between the three Kings then reigning there. He established the system of Peter's pence in all three countries of Norway, Sweden and Denmark, suppressed the evil of clerical marriages which had crept in, established a metro-

politan see at Nidaros for Norway and brought all three countries into closer relationship with the Holy See.

On his return to Rome, the date of which is uncertain, but it was between the beginning of July and the end of November, 1153, Anastasius II., who had succeeded Eugenius III. at the ripe old age of eighty, was occupying the Papal throne, but he died on December 3 of that same year, and the following day Cardinal Breakspear was elected by a conclave of thirty-two Cardinals as his successor. It is thought that his eminently successful mission in Scandinavia greatly conduced to his election.

Nicholas accepted the offer unwillingly, but believing it to be a Divine call he dared not refuse it, and took the name of Adrian IV. The state of the whole Catholic Church at that time was enough to make the boldest heart quail at having to rule it. A movement which might be called mediæval modernism was, like its twentieth century counterpart, though in a less degree, attempting to sap the very foundations of Christianity. This "new philosophy," as it was called, had two great exponents whose names stand above the others involved in it—Abelard, who retracted and died a holy death as a monk, and Arnold of Brescia, whose heresy was combined with revolutionary doctrines which, had they prevailed, would have been subversive of all order. He attacked the temporal power of the Pope and stirred the people up against the religious orders with exaggerated accounts of their wealth and luxury, declaring that no monk or priest holding property could be saved. He had been largely instrumental in establishing a republic in Rome, which had driven the saintly Eugenius III. from his capital into exile.

At the time of Adrian's accession the power of this republic was not quite so strong as it had been, but Arnold was inflaming the people with his revolutionary and schismatical ravings. While this internal discord was wringing the heart of Rome itself two other powers were threatening the Papal dominions. On the one hand Adrian's great enemy, Frederick Barbarossa, the German King, was advancing towards Rome from the north with a large army, with what intentions the new Pope did not yet know, and on the other hand William II., King of Sicily, then a great power, was threatening to attack the Holy City from the south.

These three men—Arnold of Brescia, Frederick Barbarossa and William of Sicily—were the three great enemies Adrian had to withstand and actually to take up arms against them and go out and fight them. Arnold of Brescia was soon quelled with Barbarossa's help; William of Sicily submitted ultimately, after a campaign which lasted nearly three years and was concluded by the peace of Benevento in 1156; but Frederick Barbarossa, although a reconciliation

between him and Adrian did take place, continued to trouble Adrian's peace all through his reign.

We shall content ourselves here by singling out the more dramatic episodes in Adrian's dealings with these three enemies, who with true English pluck he attacked and overthrew and defended the Church, his bride, against all the encroachments of the State and fought her battles in a way which ought to have earned for him the lasting gratitude of all Christendom, for seldom has the Catholic Church had so bold and brave a champion of her rights.

The root of all the strife which disturbed Adrian's reign was the struggle of the secular power to suppress the ecclesiastical and exalt itself over the Church, whether Arnold of Brescia was its exponent or William of Sicily or Frederick Barbarossa. Put briefly, the aim of each of these three was to exalt that power for which he stood over the Church. In Arnold it was the power of democracy; in William of Sicily, the regal power of an usurping neighbor, and in Frederick Barbarossa, the imperial power, all of which rose in rebellion against the Pope, determined to wrest the temporal power from him and to crush the Church as far as possible. How history is repeating itself in our day the briefest glance at the reign of the English Pope will show.

At the time of Adrian's accession Arnold had incited the Roman citizens to destroy the palaces of the Cardinals and of some of the nobility who were loyal to the Pope, and as the Cardinal of St. Pudenziana was going to the Vatican to congratulate Adrian upon his accession he was attacked and mortally wounded in the street. The new Pope immediately laid the city under an interdict, and this severe measure, well merited as it was, soon brought the people to their senses, for it was a terrible punishment. The churches were all closed. Mass ceased, the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion could only be administered to the dying, and even they could not receive Extreme Unction nor could the dead be buried in consecrated ground; marriages were celebrated with maimed rites on a tomb instead of at the altar. Adrian insisted upon the banishment of Arnold of Brescia before he would remove the interdict. The Senate agreed to this, and on Maunday Thursday the interdict was removed.

After this Adrian had William of Sicily to deal with, for at Easter he had invaded Italy at Salerno. Him the Pope excommunicated, but until Adrian had ascertained Frederick's intentions he could not take up arms against the Sicilian King. Barbarossa was now marching towards Rome, and when he reached San Quirico he met an embassy of three Cardinals from the Pope, which crossed with the ambassadors Frederick was sending to Adrian. Meanwhile Fred-

erick had induced the nobles who were sheltering Arnold of Brescia since his banishment to give him up, and he in his turn delivered him to the Cardinals, who took the turbulent demagogue back to Rome with them, where he was promptly executed by Peter, the Prefect of the city.

Some writers say this unfortunate man was burnt alive, others say he was hanged and his body burnt and the ashes thrown into the Tiber to prevent the Roman populace from causing another tumult by honoring his corpse as an emblem of liberty. Adrian was at Viterbo at the time, and neither he nor Barbarossa had anything to do with the execution, which was the work of Peter, the Prefect, who took the law into his own hands and precipitated matters for fear of another rebellion breaking out in Rome.

At length Adrian ascertained from Frederick's ambassadors that their master was coming to Rome with peaceful intentions as a faithful son of the Church, to ask the Pope to grant him the imperial crown. A meeting was then arranged between the Pope and the King at Nepi, near which place the German army was encamped. Here occurred one of the most famous historical scenes, typical as it was of the whole struggle of which it was an epitome, between the Pope and the Emperor; in other words, between the Church and the State.

When the Pope, mounted upon his white charger and surrounded by his suite of Cardinals, Bishops, priests and acolytes, arrived at the door of Frederick's tent Barbarossa went out to meet his spiritual sovereign, and according to custom and *étiquette* should have held the Holy Father's stirrup while he dismounted, but this the haughty young King refused to do. Then ensued a very awkward pause. Adrian, with great dignity, waited for the accustomed act of homage to be performed. Barbarossa remained rebellious and obstinate, while the Cardinals were frightened and fled to Castellano, leaving the Pope alone in his enemy's camp.

Adrian was quite equal to the occasion. He quietly dismounted and seated himself upon the throne prepared for him, and doubtless Barbarossa thought he had won the battle, instead of which he had met his master, for when he prostrated himself at the Pope's feet, as in duty bound, Adrian refused to give him the kiss of peace until he had performed the customary act of homage. Matters were now at a deadlock and ended by Adrian going back to Nepi for the night, while Frederick took counsel with his courtiers and slept upon the situation, which was probably rather an uneasy couch. However, the next morning Barbarossa, who strikes us as behaving rather like an ill-mannered boy, had come to a better mind, and when that day Adrian once more approached the royal tent the haughty monarch

dismounted and meekly held his stirrup "*cum jucunditate*," as Boso, who no doubt was an eye-witness of the scene, reports. Thereupon the Pope folded his rebellious son in his arms and gave him the kiss of peace. The Pope and King then returned to Rome, where Frederick and his soldiers helped to reduce the insurgent citizens to submission, and a few days later received the imperial crown he so greatly coveted from the hands of the Pope in St. Peter's.

This dramatic reconciliation did not prove a lasting one. Till the end of Adrian's reign Barbarossa continued to give him trouble from time to time. As soon as peace was restored in Rome itself, with Barbarossa's help, Adrian had to turn his attention to William the Norman of Sicily, who is described by Cardinal Boso as having "*insolently erected his horn*," and now Adrian himself took the field, Barbarossa went back to Germany with his tired soldiers and Adrian, who was not strong enough to enter his capital alone, took up his headquarters at Benevento. During the first part of this Sicilian campaign William was victorious, but ultimately he yielded to the Pope, and the celebrated peace of Benevento was concluded between them. Adrian, who had previously excommunicated William, absolved him and gave him the kiss of peace, and William then did homage for his crown.

By the terms of this treaty Adrian vindicated all the rights of Holy Church, from none of which would he budge an inch, and secured her supremacy in all matters ecclesiastical, and in return he granted to William and his heirs the kingdom of Sicily, the duchy of Apulia and the principality of Capua, for all of which William swore fealty to the Holy Father.

This alliance of Adrian and William displeased Barbarossa and was doubtless one of the causes of his conduct at the great Diet of Besanco, when a letter from Adrian inquiring why Frederick had not taken steps to punish an outrage which had been committed in Burgundy against the aged Archbishop of Lund gave the haughty Emperor great offense. In this memorable letter Adrian spoke of having "*conferred the imperial crown*" upon Frederick, who chose to consider this expression "*conferred*" meant that he only held his crown as a vassal of the Pope.

When this letter was read at the Diet Barbarossa's rage knew no bounds. The Pope's legates had a narrow escape of being struck down by one of Frederick's courtiers, and they were sent away the next morning with instructions to go home the shortest way and not to turn aside to the east or the west, and they took with them a most insolent letter written by Frederick to their master.

Adrian returned a conciliatory reply to this epistle and sent it by two Cardinals, who on their journey fell into the hands of two robber

lords, but were eventually rescued and met Frederick at Augsburg. This letter had the desired effect, and peace between Pope and Emperor was once more proclaimed, but only to be broken very shortly afterwards. There were several causes for this final rupture. One was Barbarossa's marriage with Beatrice, a beautiful Burgundian heiress, during the lifetime of Adelheide, his first wife, whom he had divorced in 1153. Another cause was a dispute about the appointment of the Archbishop of Ravenna. Frederick wished to put a young imperialist, the Count of Blandrada, into the vacant see, but Adrian opposed this because he already held an appointment at St. Peter's, and, moreover, he desired to retain him in Rome.

A third cause was Frederick's insolence in taking upon himself to decide a quarrel which had arisen between the cities of Bergamot and Brescia, which the Pope was himself engaged in settling. For this impertinent and aggressive interference Adrian threatened to lay Frederick's kingdom under an interdict and Barbarossa complained that the messenger who bore this letter was in rags. He sent a very angry and insolent reply and ordered his scribe to put his name before the Holy Father's in inditing the reply. This led to a severe rebuke from Adrian in answer, and that in turn to another and still more impertinent and angry letter from the Emperor.

As Frederick persisted in living with the beautiful Beatrice, Adrian threatened him with excommunication and was on the point of carrying this threat into execution when his own death, from a quinsy, took place at Anagni on September 1, 1159, after a short illness. Frederick, however, did not escape excommunication, which was pronounced against him by Adrian's successor, Alexander III.

Even so slight a sketch of the reign of Adrian IV. as the present one must include the mention of the vexed question of the donation of Ireland to England and the celebrated bull "*Laudabiliter*," in which it is said to have been conferred. Great controversy has arisen upon this subject, and great authorities are quoted upon both sides, some writers, as Lingard, Mr. Raby² and Father Pfulf, asserting, and others, like Abbot Gasquet and Mr. Thatcher,³ denying the authenticity of the famous bull, of which no copy is to be found in the Vatican archives. We shall not presume to enter into this much disputed point beyond saying that the more modern critics believe the bull to be a forgery, but one thing is certain—whether "*Laudabiliter*" is genuine or spurious, Adrian IV. certainly bestowed Ireland upon Henry II. of England, for we have John of Salisbury's word

² "Pope Adrian IV.," by Richard Baky, London, 1854.

³ Of Chicago University. See his "*Studies of the Bull 'Laudabiliter,'*" Chicago.

for this, and he is a most trustworthy authority. He tells us in his "*Metalogicus*" that Adrian made the donation at his request.

In treating of this delicate matter we must remember that England at this time was a Catholic country, and not being a prophet, Adrian could have had no idea that it would ever be anything else, or we may rest assured that he who defended the rights of Holy Church so nobly would have died rather than have put Catholic Ireland under a Protestant power, no matter what material advantages might have resulted to the Emerald Isle by so doing. Another thing must also be remembered—Adrian in thus bestowing Ireland upon England was quite within what were then the rights of the Pope, for by the donation of Constantine all islands, or, at any rate, all Christian islands, belonged to the Pope, and in those days he could have bestowed England upon another country had he chosen. Ireland then was a very weak power, England daily becoming stronger, and Adrian no doubt thought that Ireland would thrive better under England's protection.

Before his untimely death at Anagni he from time to time resided in Rome, where after the signing of the treaty of Benevento he took up his residence at the Lateran, and while there a deputation consisting of the Patriarch of Jerusalem and several Greek Bishops waited upon him. This fact is doubly interesting because Adrian's desire for the union of the Eastern and Western Churches is another instance of the similarity of his reign in many respects with that of the present Holy Father, who has recently received a similar deputation of Uniate Greek Bishops and expressed his desire for the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches to them.

Adrian made many improvements in Rome during his stay there and would have made many more had his life been prolonged. He frequently left the city for Anagni, where he eventually died. Among his letters, many of which are dated from Rome, it is interesting to note that one or two are to Héloïse, the former unhappy heroine of the romantic story of Abelard's love for her, who, when Adrian wrote to her, was an abbess, and the letters are simply to grant her certain permissions for her convent.

The character of Adrian IV. seems to have been a singularly lovable one. His great friend, John of Salisbury, says he was kind and patient, slow to anger and quick to pardon, a large and cheerful giver of alms, a mighty preacher, very eloquent and a proficient in church music. He was very humble, and so far from coveting the dignity to which he attained, he said that "the Chair of Peter was a thorny seat," and that "he had been between the hammer and the anvil ever since he had occupied it," and that "the only reason the

⁴ See his "*Polyeraticus*," lib. VIII.

tiara was worth having was that it burnt like fire." His motto was "Oculi mei semper ad Dominum." The description John⁴ gives of his intimacy with Adrian, who opened his innermost heart fully to his friend, is one of the most charming examples of the joys of true friendship that history records. Although Adrian possessed all these milder and more saintly virtues, he was by no means deficient, as we have tried to show, in true English courage and pluck, and the strength of will with which he defended the Church from her enemies is characterized by his detractors as obstinacy. He was a very great as well as a very good man, highly gifted both by nature and by grace, and he had the power not only of winning the love of such men as John of Salisbury and Cardinal Boso, but also of whole nations like those of Norway, Denmark and Sweden, who idolized him. John of Salisbury says that the news of Adrian's death "disturbed all Christian peoples and moved our England with a deeper grief and watered it with profuser tears."

Circumstances seem to have obscured the fame of Adrian IV., who though so great and good is by no means one of the well-known Popes. In this present slight sketch we have not been able to do more than try to rouse the interest of our readers sufficiently to induce them to study his history for themselves.

DARLEY DALE.

Gloucestershire, England.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPES.

Duchesne, English translation. Kegan Paul & Co., London, 1908.

NOWADAYS in England to draft a bill, get it through all its parliamentary stages and make it finally a law by royal assent is a long business, but in the end the law becomes a working reality. Not so was it of old when an imperial edict was called a law—*quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem*—yet was often in its result quite inefficient. Pathetically sometimes the Emperors had to appeal for compliance in their repeated enactments against fiscal abuses. Take another contrast: To-day a country is definitely independent or dependent; of old provinces nominally subject often asserted their power to do as they liked, in spite of the higher authority, which was like a weak master in a schoolroom over unruly boys who do as they are told not.

Observations of the above kind will serve to introduce what Mgr. Duchesne, on the principle that practice cannot exactly follow theory,

has said about the relation of the Popes as to the temporal domains towards the Byzantine Emperors in the sixth, the seventh and the eighth centuries. While in theory the Emperor regarded the Pope as a subject, "in reality the Pope was elected by the Romans at Rome, with imperial sanction as a matter of form. As a fact, he owed his prestige and position to the influence of St. Peter. The Papal influence was by no means confined to the Church. The Pope's experience, his moral authority, his sound financial position and his powers of administration were a valuable help in the conduct of temporal affairs. We see him concerning himself, apparently in no meddlesome spirit, with war operations, the arrangement of treaties, the appointment of officials, the management of the State exchequer, as well as with municipal enterprises such as the repairing of ramparts and aqueducts and schemes for the public food supply" (page 14). The writer further remarks that probably the moral power of the Popes would have become a strong factor in the political world "if the boundary line between the spiritual and the temporal sphere had been less jealously defined." In affairs as they actually occurred the distinction was not always kept as rigidly as it existed in the canons of councils; still its existence there was an important feature to be recognized, especially when, after the twelfth century, the inquiry became explicit into the relation of Papal to regal power. As to the multiplicity of the Pope's activities before civil States had fully developed their powers, a moderate acquaintance with the life of a Pontiff so well known to English readers as Gregory the Great will amply witness to the fact; beyond the cares officially his own he was overwhelmed with temporal administrations.

Thus we have brought before us a question well worth our study, the relation between *sacerdotium et imperium*—powers spiritual and powers temporal. The case is one of combined theory and practice, in which the latter often got ahead of the former; for though theory from the beginning was laid down in broad outlines, the detailed features were left to be evolved by the suggestions and the exigencies of events as they occurred. Even the Church of Christ, so perfect in its foundation and in the vital principle of its growth, needed time for the discovery of its varying adaptations to the world, in which it had to build up its ever extending structure. It was not at first, with a rigidity beyond alteration, settled how the Church was to work with the State towards the twofold end of human society, its welfare on earth and in heaven; of which double purpose only one part arrested the eye of St. Thomas of Canterbury when he told Henry II. that the aim of that monarch's sovereignty was *ut totum reducet ad pacem et unitatem ecclesia*.

FIRST PERIOD—UP TO CHARLEMAGNE.

1. Under the pagan Empire of Rome toleration was the small mercy which the Church at the outset sought from the State, with the addition of just an occasional act of protection such as was exemplified in St. Paul's appeal to Cæsar. At first the mighty world-power almost ignored the new faith, regarding it as a part of Judaism till the opposition of Jews to Christians was forced upon its notice by the manifest hostility of the former to the Nazarenes. Moreover, Rome saw that the Christian religion aspired to become a universal creed, everywhere dominant and exclusive, refusing the amalgamation which other foreign religions were ready to make with the cult of the Emperor, who personified the world-power as divine. Yet in regard to actual danger of encroachment, the contemptuous utterances about the religion of Christ showed how little it was expected by its enemies to fulfill its own boundless aspirations and to take rank side by side with the principate itself. A Roman lawyer of the time would have treated with incredulity a prediction that within about six centuries the statute book of his masters would contain the utterance: "The two greatest gifts vouchsafed by the divine clemency to men are the priesthood and the Empire, the one ministering in Divine things, the other ruling in human affairs, both proceeding from the same principle."¹ Long before this concord was reached the Apostles appreciated the advantages for religion derived from the *Pax et Delectis Romana* and from such justice as Rome laudably upheld, which, though not perfect, was relatively to the rule of other powers very good. St. Peter (I. Pet. ii., 13-18), after his Master's example, and St. Paul (Rom. xiii., 1-8) preached that to Cæsar should loyally be yielded the things of Cæsar. This was in the spirit of the Old Testament (Prov. viii., 15). Several interpreters of II. Thess. ii., 7 were of opinion that there the restraining power was that of the Roman Empire, which was keeping the world from falling to pieces, lapsing into chaos, a catastrophe which in the fifth century did begin to occur.

At the time saints witnessing the calamity thought that the end of the world had come and that the restoration of public order was hopeless. To a certain extent Christians had accepted for true the proud boast of *Roma æterna*,² which some fancied that they found sanctioned in the book of Daniel. Lactantius wrote: "This very state of things declares the ruin of the world but for the city of

¹ Justinian Novell. VI. Præfat. Cf. St. Fulgentius of Ruspa. De Veritate. In ecclesia nemo pontifice potior: in oculo Christianis nemo Imperatore celsior.

² "His ego nec vetus rerum nec tempora pono: imperium sine fine dedi."

Rome standing in its integrity. There, there is the State which still sustains the world, and we must pray God to maintain it," and delay the coming of Antichrist.³

Yet St. John the Apostle had lived long enough to speak unfavorably of the Empire when writing his Apocalypse after his experience of the persecutions by Nero and Domitian; he took up against Rome the cry that a Roman had raised against Carthage and the prophets against Babylon: "The city shall be destroyed." The Roman Babylon must perish as had done the Messopotamian. "Babylon the great has fallen; her sins have reached unto heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities" (Apoc. xviii.).

Meanwhile any mark of favor from the Empire was recorded with gratitude and with hope. Tertullian put on record that but for the opposition of the Senate Tiberius would have given Christ a place among the gods of the State. Alexander Severus ruled that a certain property had better be assigned for the benefit of the Church than made over to profane uses⁴—*melius esse ut quomodocumque Deus illic colatur*. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, praised Galilianus, who, however, was a persecutor in his turn, for befriending the Church after the Decian persecution: "The holy and pious Emperor, surviving the seventh year, is now in the ninth, of which we are about to celebrate the festival."⁵ And Aurelian received from the Christians the testimony of his honor that he lent his support to the Church when it deposed from his bishopric the heretic, Paul of Samosata, and tried to wrest from his unwilling hands the episcopal property.⁶ The Emperor decided that the ecclesiastical buildings should go to those who were in union with the Bishops of Italy and of Rome. As the pagan line of Emperors was ending in the West, the acknowledgment was paid Maxentius that he stopped the persecution and restored to the Christians their confiscated property.⁷ In such small favors the Church made her recognitions to an empire whose more general policy was conveyed in the stern words, *Non licet esse urbis*.

A new era started with the conversion of Constantine, who though he delayed his baptism to the end gave tokens of sincere attachment to the civil prosperity which he believed to follow upon his adherence to Christ; for there is no harm in rejoicing at a temporal reward. In the Justinian legislation we find the same idea: *Praeceptum imperatorice majestatis curam perspicimus verae religionis imaginem cuius si cultum tueri potuerimus iter prosperitatis*

³ De Div. Justit. VII., 25.

⁴ Lampidius, Alex. Sever, 49.

⁵ Euseb., H. E. VII., 23.

⁶ *Idem*, VII., 30.

⁷ *Idem*, VIII., 14.

humanis aspiciamus inceptis.⁸ The argument from worldly success becomes bad when it stands alone, apart from conduct defensible on its own merits and more still when it is clearly impious. Such was the bad case of the Jews in their defiance of Jeremias: "As for the word which thou has spoken to us, we will not hearken to it; but we will certainly do whatever thing goeth forth from our mouth, to burn incense unto the Queen of Heaven, as we and our fathers have done before. For then we had plenty of food and fared well, and saw no evil." Upon this piece of profanity God's terrible curse came: "Behold I will watch over them for evil and not for good." (Jer. xxiv.)

A severe disappointment in regard to the Church met Constantine in the Donatist and the Arian heresy. Here the very mistress of peace fell into harsh discord within her own home of religion. The Emperor tried to have the disturbances quieted by synods, one following upon another in rapid succession. To his chagrin, the authority of the councils was not obeyed. And it was in these gatherings that there appeared foreshadowed another discord—that between the Church and the State. In theory Constantine declared correctly enough his own position as "Bishop in things external," without right to judge on doctrine.⁹ Rufinus reports his words thus: "God established you to be Bishops and gave you to be judges even over ourselves, whilst you cannot be judged by men."¹⁰ When, after a double condemnation, one at Rome and another at Arles, the Donatists still appealed to the Emperor, he finally yielded and himself listened to what they had to urge, though he assumed this office under protest: "They look for judgment to me who myself am looking to be judged by Christ. I tell the truth as it really stands when I say that the judgment of the priest is the judgment of our Lord Himself." Some theologians, however, go beyond strict limits when they teach that Constantine in his coöperation with the synods was using no power of his own, but was acting exclusively as Papal Delegate. There really was a joint employment of civil and ecclesiastical powers. In his own order, which was other than the Pope's order, the Emperor in early times, though not in the time of the Vatican Council, summoned, watched over and confirmed councils, embodying them in the Justinian legislation. Of his own coöperation Constantine speaks as a thing of "divine appointment."

Pope Celestine was not jealous in his acknowledgments when he wrote to Theodosius about the synod which the Emperor had ordered—*quam esse jussistis*¹¹—and the assembled fathers in session

⁸ Novel. Tit., III.

⁹ Euseb., Vita Constant, IV., 24.

¹⁰ Rufinus, H. E. I., 2, Migne, t. VIII., col. 488.

¹¹ Harduin, I., 146.

after session of a synod used such phrases as that they were gathered together "by the grace of God and the convocation of the Emperor," or "by the grace of God and the oracular voice of the Emperor."¹² These words are in the Acts of the Council, and to repudiate them would be worse than bad policy. We need not fear what so easily received an orthodox interpretation of the deference paid to Emperors when their aid was so opportune for the Church. The Roman Canonist Cavignis says: "*Data pace ecclesia ipsa aliquantulum defert imperatoribus Christianis; sed semper independentiam affirmat quoties ipsi nomine proprio se ingerunt.*"¹³ When later ages are under discussion Mgr. Duchesne tells how the Carolingian and other Emperors used a sort of corrective attitude to some abuses, and sought to rescue Papal elections from the hands of a very unworthy clique, who put into office not fit candidates, but their own creatures. Extreme necessities of this kind called for action which normally was beyond the office of an Emperor in regard to the Church. But if at times it was the Popes who needed some control, at other times the Emperors distinctly exceeded their powers in employing an unwarrantable coercion. Justinian, who had done so much good for the Church, treated Pope Vigilius with a disgraceful tyranny. In short, imperial action toward the Papacy was in part official and profitable; in part extra official and still profitable; in part usurpatory and injurious.¹⁴

It is one thing to have rights and another to be able to use them. At times the Popes were unable to give effect to their jurisdiction without lay help. To assemble the Vatican Council it was enough to issue the summons and leave the Bishops to make their own way to Rome; but so independent a process was not always within the Church's command. Of the feeble times Mgr. Duchesne writes: "*La papauté telle que l'occident la connaît plus tard était encore à naître. La place qu'elle n'occupait pas encore l'était s'y installa sans hésitation. La religion de l'empereur non seulement en ce sens qu'elle était professée par lui mais encore en ce sens qu'elle était dirigée par lui. Tel n'est pas le droit mais il est le fait.*"¹⁵ About the period here described violence was used when Constantine had Pope Martin seized in Rome and carried off to the East, there to die in exile. The Empress Theodora had the like treatment inflicted on Pope Silverius and the Gothic Emperor Theodoric copied the bad example in regard to Pope John I. Abuse of authority by those in

¹² Harduin, I., 437.

¹³ Jus. Eccles. lib. IV., Cap. III., 6.

¹⁴ Of the Emperor, Gregory the Great wrote: "Conservende sacerdotali caritati inarguit Deus dominari sum non solis militibus sed etiam sacerdotibus concessit." Regest 50, 37; 5, 37.

¹⁵ L'Histoire de l'Eglise, Tom. II., p. 660.

possession of it is what Bishop Creighton has declared to be one of the most revolting features of human history; and in view of so many undoubted cases of imperial tyranny which offers matter for our reprobation, we may spare our denunciation when in abnormal cases the Emperors acted somewhat as a wife might act to control her husband or parishioners might act to control their parishes. They are not the superior powers, and yet in an emergency they assume the direction. After the Popes had praised civil princes for their energetic suppression of heresy it became harder to stop their meddling in spiritual affairs when it became a sheer impertinence.

There are words of authoritative writers which may seem expressly to put Bishops into the dominion of secular princes. The case was not really to the point where Isidore of Pelisum wrote *ecclesiam esse in regno*, for he was speaking after the manner of the writer of the letter to Dioquetus, who said the Church was in the world in its life-giving soul. But there is some point in quoting St. Optatus, who wrote *ecclesia in republica, non republica in ecclesia*. The explanation is that he was referring to the assistance which the Church got from Christian Emperors in contrast to what she suffered from barbarous nations. "In the Roman Empire the priesthood, and chastity, and the virgin state are held sacred, whereas these have no such reverence among the barbarous."¹⁶ St. Ambrose gave the counterpart to the statement of St. Optatus in the words: "*Imperator intra ecclesiam non super ecclesiam est.*"¹⁷

Next we reach the third stage of the history between Constantine and Charlemagne, and it is marked by circumstances which called forth from two Popes especially a declaration of Papal and of imperial rights so clearly formulated as to leave nothing to be desired in the way of essential distinction. Pope Gelasius (492-496), in his contention with the Greek Emperor Anastasius I., proclaimed that there were two distinct powers, one having care of earthly, the other of heavenly concerns, but that Emperors in their relation to Christian subjects with duties to perform to the Church were bound to accept her authoritative teachings, though they were not so subject in their own temporal government as such. This Papal letter, which, after having been adopted by a synod of Paris, found its way into the Capitularies of Charlemagne and became quite a classical document, was occasioned by a difficulty raised in the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno (474), who wished to mediate between Antichene Nestorianism and Alexandrian Monophysitism. With this pacificatory purpose Zeno ventured to modify the decrees of Chalcedon passed in 451 against Eutyches Simplicius, who was

¹⁶ De Schiam, III., 3.

¹⁷ Sermo.

Pope in Zeno's time. As a later consequence of Zeno's document, his successor, Leo II., fell under the reproof of Pope Felix II., and another successor, Anastasius I., under that of Gelasius. This is the incident with which we are now concerned. In his remembrance Gelasius appealed to precedents in Jewish history where Nathan, in things spiritual, assumed control over King David, and in Christian history where a like authority was shown by St. Ambrose over Theodosius I., by Leo I. over Theodosius II., by Pope Hilary over the Western Emperor Authencius, by Popes Simplicius and Felix II. over the Emperors Basiliscus and Zeno. Thence Gelasius conferred the right of the Popes to teach the Emperors as they taught other members of the Church,¹⁸ yet so as to keep distinct the two jurisdictions—the ecclesiastical and the civil—and to do no injury to the latter in its own proper domain. These two powers united in Melchisedech had been divided in Christendom *ita est imperatore pro ce terma vita pontificibus indigerent et pontifices pro temporalum cursu rerum imperialibus dispositoribus utantur*. Later on this harmonious combination, which is so needful and so exclusive of the idea that each power may go its own way in utter disregard to the other, was called by St. Peter Damian *una dignitas in Christiano populo, mutuo quadam foedere copulata*.¹⁹ A similar letter to that of Gelasius was written by his successor, Symmachus, in remonstrance to the same Anastasius.

A further ramification of our subject presents itself obtrusively in the large employment of clerics to discharge the offices which now is assigned to laymen. Civil government employed clerics very extensively. As long as the legal tribunals were still conducted by pagan administration St. Paul urged the Christians not to have recourse to their courts. He adopts even a tone of banter against the objection the Christians might have made among themselves qualified to arbitrate.²⁰ With the accession of Christian Emperors difficulty on the score of paganism in the civil processes began to cease. Constantine ordered his magistrates to execute the decisions of the Bishops in civil cases. So reports the historian Sozomon, though his account has been questioned. Over criminal cases, at

¹⁸ We must not lay undue stress on a sort of revival in the position when emperors gave exhortations to Popes. The incident belongs to a later date, but may be cited to illustrate our present topic. Duchesne writes, page 110: "The letters of Charlemagne to Leo III. are full of moral exhortations. Leo is to be a good Pope, pious, faithful in his duties and strict in maintaining discipline, especially in repressing simony. In all those directions Charlemagne displays a certain consciousness of moral authority and of the advantage of having good ecclesiastical leaders in his kingdom."

¹⁹ Labe Concll. IV., 1,298.

²⁰ I. Cor. v., 1-9; II. Cor. x., 6 Sqq.; II. Thess. v., 12-15; I. Tim. i., 2; II. Tim. iv., 13.

least those of the worst kind, the State reserved its claims. There came a decree of Arcadius and Honorius limiting the episcopal decisions to ecclesiastical causes, but its efficiency seems not to have been great: "*Quoties de religione agitur episcopis convenit judicare; caeteros vero causas legibus oportet rudisi.*"²¹ Civil cases, with consent of both parties, might go before the Bishops if they were not criminal, and effect could be given by the style of the sentences, which could not be done to-day. So far the Bishops were more than arbitrators. Criminal cases were reserved,²² yet clerical offenders, except for the greater crimes of treason, murder, etc., were committed to their own Judges; but the punishment was sometimes restricted by varying laws till Justinian tried to bring more conformity into the enactment. He exempted Bishops from the jurisdiction of secular courts on all charges against them.²³ Ecclesiastical sentences in their penalties stopped short of bloodshed, but could go as far as banishment, confiscation and imprisonment, but the execution was left to the civil magistrates. Not till the rise of their temporal sovereignty did the Popes get a full jurisdiction over crime.

Being made protectors of the defenseless and having a judgment in all cases such as wills in which oaths were concerned, the Bishops had a heavy charge in looking after the rights of widows, orphans, prisoners, slaves and minors. The rules of society being enforced by oath, disobedience of their statutes was tried under the head of perjury, and so fell under episcopal cognizance.²⁴ This rule held later when the universities were formed. No wonder that Bishops groaned under their multiplied responsibilities, as we hear from St. Augustine, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom, Synesius Ep. 57, and the cares also grew with another development—that of public penance—which in some cases was allowed to stand as a substitute for a civil penalty.

As to municipal offices, Duchesne denies that in the fourth and fifth centuries those strictly were undertaken by Bishops, being forbidden by the canon law. In later times there is frequent mention of the Bishops as *defensor civitatis*.²⁵ Again, there was secular business as a source of income to the clergy. The lower ranks were necessitated to use some such means of self-support, and becoming occupations were quite within their rights, after the example of St. Paul, who supported himself by tent making. When the desire of greater gain arose devices were adopted which were wrong.

²¹ Cod. Theodosios, Lib. XVI., Tit. XI., N. 1.

²² Cod. Justin., Lib. I., Tit. V., N. 7.

²³ Thomassin, Lib. III., C. 103.

²⁴ Thomassin, Tom. II., Lib. III., Ch. 87-94.

²⁵ See Cod. Justin De Auctoritate Episcoporum.

At first pagan requirements connected with the situation had shut out Christians from lucrative employment, but as these were removed by the converted Emperors, the professional life of painters, sculptors, schoolmasters, lawyers, soldiers were opened to the faithful, and clerks were on the lookout for the new emoluments. St. Cyprian²⁶ has bitter complaints to make under this head of avarice in the clergy who frequented fairs and practiced usury. The canons were specially severe on these money-lenders, but encouraged agriculture. St. Paulinus of Nola loved to engage in the humble work of the fields. The soldier's life was not suitable to clerics, and we have to wait till they become feudal lords before we find them notoriously following this line of secular life, but even lax Christians at first had been shut out from it to some extent by its pagan requirements. Tertullian,²⁷ Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Lactantius and Basil dwell on the unsuitableness, but St. Augustine asserted the duty of the Christian soldier not to desert his standard.

As illustrative of the pre-Carolingian period, the case of St. Gregory I. and of the Church which he founded in England will afford a good example interesting to English readers. The close of the sixth century shows us Gregory I. a faithful helper of the Greek Emperor Maurice in the government of the western part of his domain. He was a Pope overburdened with a multiplicity of mundane cares, undertaken in no mundane spirit, during very troublous times. In his sense of oppressedness he exclaimed: "*Ecce jam pone nulla est sæculi actio quam non sacerdotes administrant.*"²⁸ To the Eastern Emperor he was habitually deferential, one of the most extraordinary instances occurring in regard to his post as distributor of the imperial decrees throughout his patriarchate. Maurice had sent him an order for publication that certain persons engaged in the service of the State should not abandon it to enter the religious life. Gregory despatched to its several quarters the ordinance, but told the Emperor that while he was complying he did so under protest. "Yielding to the mandate, I have circulated the letter; but inasmuch as it is not in accordance with God's will, I have called the attention of your Majesty to this fact. Thus I have observed a double duty—that of obedience to the Emperor and that of not having been silent on the divine claims."²⁹ He elsewhere gave it as his principle: "What the Emperor does we follow, if the canons allow; otherwise we bear it as far as it entails no sin."³⁰

²⁶ De Lapsu, 6.

²⁷ Apul 42. The mental character of work is easily removed if the workers are honorable, as we see in nurses, doctors, settlement helpers.

²⁸ Hom. XVII. in Evangel.

²⁹ Lib. III., Ep. 61.

³⁰ Ep. II., 22.

His acquiescence in the case of exclusion from religious life was not such as might be gathered from the letter above quoted. The letter shows that he proposed to the Emperor his plan not to take public servants into religion except with great caution, and he expressed his confidence that such consideration for the interests of the State would satisfy its ruler.³¹ More difficulty has been raised about an apparent disregard for Maurice in Gregory's loyal acceptance of his violent deposer, Phocas. Throughout it was to the Emperor that he looked for protection: "*Ab imperatore est suscipienda Christiana religionis defensor.*"³² Even when some Emperors were not all that could be desired.³³

A word in conclusion to this period may be added about Gregory's foundation, the English Church. Not much is known of ecclesiastical courts here prior to the Norman Conquest; but before that date at least we find the beginnings of those feudal dangers to the Church which were to put ecclesiastical benefices under the control of lay lords and their families, and to make temporal lords of those who held spiritual offices. Hence came prelates engrossed in secular interests and secular administration. Some Bishops, if they did not actually fight, yet accompanied their elders to battle. Bishop Stubbs states their first recorded appearance in arms 835. As to judicial functions, Lingard says that strictly these did not belong to the Bishops in civil cases, to which Stubbs adds that "the Anglo-Saxon sovereigns, acting in closest union with their Bishops, made laws which clothed the spiritual enactments with coercive authority and sometimes seemed to ignore the lines which separated the two legislatures."³⁴ England also by not accepting the Roman law kept its civil jurisdiction more national and less allied to the canon law. The penitential codes were often substituted for civil penalties, and England had some of the earliest of the known Penitential Books. Under the names of Theodore and Egbert Mosler Roland gives as an instance of the retribution that seven years penances stood in the place of the severer punishment of the State for homicide.³⁵ Nevertheless public penance was not introduced into England after the fashion of the East, where it was so elaborately organized, only to fall into speedy desuetude. It is the Penitential of Theodore that makes the observation, "*Reconciliatio penitentium in hac pronuncia*

³¹ Lib. VIII., Ep. 5; Lib. VII., Ep. 11.

³² Lib. IX., Ep. 3.

³³ In Gregory's pontificate the Lombards had not captured Rome, and one of his cares was to see to the defense of the walls and to select suitable governors, according to Justinian's commission. The Pope's anxiety extended also to his own patrimonies in Italy, Dalmatia, Gaul and Africa.

³⁴ Lectures on Medieval and Modern History.

³⁵ Gieth, Lecture XIII., Die Somtenren-Rolands, p. 248.

publica statuta non est." England was like other nations in entrusting to clerics high offices of the State. A prominent instance was St. Dunstan, who was a sort of Prime Minister to King Edgar. King Oswald made great use of his Bishop, St. Aidan. To the Archbishop of Canterbury, says Lingard,³⁶ "it belonged to summon the national councils." The Anglo-Saxon nobles being warriors, ignorant, prudent rulers, sought in educated prelates of the Church that intelligence which Plato and Aristotle agree in requiring for all true statesmanship, and Christian publicists add that the leavening of civil administration with theological principles was a great improvement to political science, especially after the barbarian conquerors had done much to lower the classical standard of Greece and Rome. The Anglo-Saxon tribes largely kept their old customs with such purification of them as Christianity required. It was a cry continued after the Norman Conquest: "We do not want the laws of England to be changed." Bishops as Ministers might at least change for the better the application of barbarous laws.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

RELATIVE ANGLO-SAXON AND GAELIC CIVILIZATION.

WHEN the cynical Roman governor asked the Apostle Paul, "What is truth?" he put a less difficult query than he thought. Had he asked him instead, "What is civilization?" perhaps Paul might have found it no easy task to give an instantaneous definition of the term to the representative of the power that recognized no civilization outside the boundaries of its own great empire. So when the Rev. Sydney Smith dogmatically declared (*Edinburgh Review*, 1807) that the Irish in the time of Queen Elizabeth "unquestionably were the most barbarous people in Europe," he wrote the verdict as a member of a packed jury. He belonged to the nation that had schooled the people in barbarism and then cynically taunted them with having been apt pupils. He himself controverts the verdict. Out of his own mouth he shows in the very same pages that the English in Ireland in that reign were more barbarous than the Irish. Writing about conditions within and beyond the Pale, and on the borders, he tells of the constant warfare that prevailed, mostly over trifles—commonly, as he says, for cows. To his mind, it seems, that it was not the question of property right that made a quarrel right or wrong, but the amount involved—not a

³⁶ Anglo-Saxon Church, Vol. I., Chap. II.

very creditable view for a clergyman of the Church of England to take, it may well be conceded. Then he goes on to say that "the Irish, over whom the sovereigns of England affected a sort of nominal dominion, were entirely governed by their own laws; and so very little connection had they with the justice of the invading country that it was as lawful to kill an Irishman as it was to kill a badger or a fox. The instances are innumerable where the defendant pleaded that the deceased was an Irishman, and that therefore the defendant had a right to kill him; and upon the proof of Hibernicism acquittal followed, of course."

Now, the reverend author of this self-stultifying illustration had the reputation of being one of the wittiest Englishmen of his time: and here is a new proof of the truism that what is called wit is not always wisdom. The Irish, whom he had branded as the most barbarous people in Europe, would have been quite justified in killing an Englishman in Ireland, because he was to him an invader, a robber and a murderer. What law was it that made it "lawful," as he says, to reverse the natural law, and permit the doer of the wrong to slay the man he had wronged, besides robbing him? Who was the true barbarian in this case, the "civilized" Englishman or the barbarous Hibernian?

It was on the testimony of men like Spenser, Raleigh, Campion and other settlers and adventurers in Ireland that this verdict of barbarism was rendered against the Irish nation. Edmund Burke said it was impossible to frame an indictment against a whole people, but the poets and writers of Elizabeth's time found no such difficulty. Some of these had assisted, as in the case of Spenser and Raleigh, in slaying and plundering the Irish people; and they completed the infamy—at least Spenser did—by maligning them most wickedly and infamously as well. This is a blot upon the name of the author of "*The Faërie Queen*" that not all the water in the ocean could wash out. It will cling to his memory forever.

The law which made it "lawful" to kill an Irishman simply because he was a native Hibernian was the atrocious enactment known as the Statute of Kilkenny. It was passed at the dictation of a monarch who in his own person offered one refutation of the false verdict of the Rev. Sydney Smith—Edward the Second. This unfortunate monarch furnishes in the manner of his death the most signal negation of the charge that the Irish were the most barbarous people of the Tudor age. He was an amiable and unaggressive king toward his subjects, but he was weak and foolish in his attachment to personal favorites like Pere Gaveston and young Spenser—men of gaiety and wit such as the French kings liked to have to amuse their dull hours. These weaknesses drew

on him the jealousy of even his own family. His very mother joined the cabal against him, and formed plans for his deposition and death. He was forced by the Parliament, at their instigation, to abdicate in favor of his son; and then seized and thrust into prison, under the care of two noted miscreants, Sir Thomas de Jurnay and Sir John Mattrevers, who were in the pay of his enemies. These fell upon him once the gates of the castle had closed on his departing guards and put him to death by the most horrible form of torture that fiends in human shape could devise. They forced a red-hot iron into his body and burned out his intestines. To this frightful tragedy the wretched victim's mother, Queen Isabella, it should be remembered, was an indirect accessary, inasmuch as she participated in the plot that brought about his deposition and imprisonment. Such was the character of the English at that period. Let any one who may be skeptical regarding this conclusion take up Shakespeare's historical plays, and read "King John" and "King Henry VI." There he will find ample corroboration of the fact that even royal and aristocratic women were not restrained by the traditions of their sex from the indulgence of their passions when fallen enemies were in their power. The castles of the feudal lords in England were, during the Wars of the Roses and the Anglo-Norman regime, generally speaking, the scenes of tragedies as ghastly and revolting as ever were perpetrated by Oriental despots. Was not this barbarism? No English writer has ever charged against the Irish chiefs that they had the temerity to challenge their would-be conquerors' claim to preëminence in the invention of refinements of torture for captured enemies or conspiring members of their own families. The test of barbarism is the passion for inhuman cruelty, and this came into Ireland along with the Anglo-Norman adventurers, who laid the foundations of the present English monarchy.

It is difficult to understand why such a work as Fynes Moryson's "Travels" is republished now, after the lapse of three centuries, save on the theory that, alarmed at the progress of the Celtic Renaissance, the enemies of Ireland hope to injure the movement by a depiction of the manners and customs of the Celt in former times. Every race and every nation that ever became great had their own manners and customs, racy of the soil and the people; but there was no homogeneity of race and people in England when Moryson wrote his book. The Anglo-Saxons had been submerged, and the Anglo-Normans were on the upper crust. The process of assimilation was only beginning. Let us inquire into the grounds of the claim of superior civilization advanced by writers of the Elizabethan era as an excuse for the oppression of the Irish nation.

Charles Dickens and other English writers have endeavored to justify the invasion of Ireland by describing the last monarch of all Ireland, Roderick O'Connor, as a monster of cruelty. None of those gentlemen who thus criticized had made any pretense at studying Irish history or biography: they simply took the word of men like Cambrensis or Spenser as gospel. The Abbé MacGeoghegan, who did study the history and the biography of Ireland with the industry of a scholar having ample sources of information to his hand, in the archives of Louvaine and the Irish College of Paris, finds a very different verdict on the character and action of the last of the Irish High Kings. In the first year of his reign (A. D. 1166) occurred an event that while denoting the spirit of the age in the country that for long had enjoyed the distinction of being known as "the Island of Saints," also gave presage of the woe to come. This was the foundation of the Priory of All Saints, outside Dublin walls, by Dermot McMurrough, King of Leinster. It was given in charge of regular canons of the fraternity of Aronaise. A little more than four hundred years after its foundation this Priory was converted into a college, under the name of the Holy Trinity, by Queen Elizabeth of England, and endowed with the wealth of those Ulster chiefs who had resisted her power as usurpation; and Dermot McMurrough, who had originally established the foundation, was the villain who by his wicked conduct was the means of bringing that usurpation into being and destroying his country's liberty as well as the Catholic Church, which had existed in it for more than a thousand years. So that there is more than one reason why the people whom Cambrensis and Spenser and Fynes Moryson so vilely slandered should take a peculiar interest in the fortunes of Trinity College, Dublin, the successor of the foundation which formerly stood on Hoggin's Green, an extramural appanage of the city of Dublin in the period of the Pale.

"Roderick," remarks McGeoghegan, "governed the Kingdom of Ireland with wisdom and moderation. He convened a synod of the States—practically a Parliament—composed of clergy and laity, amounting in numbers to thirteen hundred members and with their help enacted such laws and had them carried out by such a system of police supervision that it might be said of the island as Bede observed of the Kingdom of Northumberland in the reign of Edwin, that a woman with a new-born infant might travel over the whole island, from one sea to another, without fear of insult. This monarch," the Abbé goes on, "who was mindful of everything, knowing that amusements are essential to youth, reestablished the games of Taitan in 1168. He was also a protector of learning,

and in 1169 founded a professor's chair in Armagh in favor of strangers; finally, he watched over the administration of justice, and punished crime with severity."

The only serious acts of cruelty laid against him by the Irish historians were provoked by the rebellion of his sons, Murchard and Connor, who, with strong forces backing them, made a determined effort to dethrone him and divide his power and resources between themselves. Having been defeated by the King's forces, these unnatural sons were cast into prison, and the elder of them was condemned to lose his eyesight. This cruel punishment on the part of a parent may be deemed sufficient ground on which to justify the charge that the last of the Irish monarchs was a monster of cruelty. But, in the first place, it must be remembered that deprivation of eyes or blinding was a common form of punishment for rebels or enemies, inflicted by those who had got them in their power; and, in the second, that the King, being the sworn dispenser of justice and defender of the law, could not escape his responsibility in the meting out of punishment for treason because of the fact that the principal traitors were his own flesh and blood. Had he acted otherwise, he could not escape the still more odious accusation of being a partial judge and a dishonest administrator of the national law. The practice of blinding was in common use in England and Ireland among rival members of royal houses. Henry I. disposed of his brother's claims to the crown of William the Conqueror by having his eyes taken out and imprisoning him for life. He had a poet, who had satirized him, similarly treated, despite a universal law of the chivalric ages that this class of entertainers was exempt and allowed a license not permitted to any others about the royal court. Henry II. inflicted the same cruel deprivation upon his numerous young hostages from Wales, children of the most powerful families, because the Welsh people had risen to resist the imposition of his rule upon their country, still an independent kingdom, ruled by its own sovereigns. His father, the redoubtable Conqueror, had gone further. He had decreed, in the making of his game and forest laws, that "whoever killed a hart or a hind should be blinded. In the year 1250 the English garrison of Athlone put out the eyes of all the Connaught hostages held in the castle, in retaliation for some trouble given by the native tribes.

The practice was barbarous and most shocking to our more humane ideas of the modes in which punishment should be meted out for rebellion or resistance to authority or aggression. But it was no more barbarous in the Irish than it was in the English. Hence the attempt of English writers to affix a peculiar stigma

upon the Irish, so as to single them out for the sinister distinction of supremacy in rudeness, cruelty and disregard for the refinements of life, only prove that their authors shut their eyes to what their own writers in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle had set down, both in regard to the monarchs of the Heptarchy and those of the Norman and Plantagenet period.

The judgment which the Rev. Sydney Smith so sententiously delivered in the pages of the *Edinburgh* was arrived at on the strength of a work published by Mr. William Parnell, a member of the Irish Parliament, and an ancestor of the present family of the Parnells, of which the late Charles Stewart Parnell was the most famous member. The work was entitled "*Historical Apology for the Irish Catholics*," and was published in Dublin in 1807. Mr. Parnell, the author, was a Protestant, but one who had no sympathy with the means adopted by the Protestant English conquerors of Ireland to crush out both the religion and the nationality of the Irish people. But this spirit of justice did not prevent him from accepting without reservation the stories regarding the alleged barbarism of the native Irish—a barbarism shared in, after a little time, according to many authorities, by those Anglo-Norman adventurers who came to conquer the barbarian, but were in the end conquered by him so far as to adopt his language, his dress, his ways of life, his fosterage, his gossiping, his music and his national spirit.

Mr. Parnell took the word of Fynes Moryson for some wonderful things about the ways and morals of the native Irish, and he argued that the Catholics, if left alone and not persecuted as they had been, might never have been rebellious in Ireland. Both Mr. Parnell and the Rev. Mr. Smith were animated by the desire to have justice done by the English Government in regard to the Catholics of Ireland, and the latter points with satisfaction to the circumstance that after the cruelties to which the Irish were subjected in the reign of Queen Elizabeth—the slaughters under Carew and Mountjoy and Cosby, and the desolation of Munster by fire and famine—there was in the reign of Mary "no recrimination upon the Protestants"—that is, no retaliations—as reason why their conduct in the Elizabethan rebellions should be palliated. But does not the plea suggest that the previous argument for superior barbarity was foolish? Patience and magnanimity are surely incompatible with a state of barbarism.

If the reverend wit and satirist had looked into the matter in a way befitting the editor of a high-class publication, he would have hesitated ere committing himself to so sweeping an opinion as he did. He would, for instance, have looked into the laws and customs

which governed the people whom he branded as barbarians by way of apology for what seemed to him shortcomings on their part, and compared these with the laws and customs of the people who entered the country to rob them on the pretense of a desire to improve their religion, their morals and their manners.

Every thoughtful and humane person will admit that the system of laws which William the Conqueror imposed upon the people of England was inferior in justice and humanity to that older one which it supplanted. In Ireland the Breton laws, a much older system than that of Gavelkind, which the Saxons or Angles had brought into England, were constructed on strict principles of equity to women and children, securing to married women equality in possession of property to their husbands, and to children a proportionate share of the parents' property after death. But the law of primogeniture and entail, grafted on both the English and Irish systems after a long struggle, sacrificed the rights of all the rest to the privileges of the first-born—a truly iniquitous and barbarous system. So, too, with regard to the law of entail, the game laws, the landlord laws, and the law of debtor and creditor. All these creations of legislation were pieced together laboriously in order to carry out a fixed idea and policy of the Normans, working to an end to create and perpetuate a caste and an iron-clad system of aristocracy and feudal exclusiveness.

On their arrival in Ireland the newcomers became loud in denunciation of the Breton laws. But after they had settled down and became friendly with the people surrounding them, they found that these laws were exactly suited to the conditions of Irish life; and, throwing aside their English system, as well as their English language and garb, they proceeded to exhibit their change of mind by becoming more enthusiastic for Irish ideas than the original natives. This was the reason why a century or so after the landing of Strongbow it was found expedient by the English residents in the Pale to pass laws like the Statute of Kilkenny, prohibiting English settlers from intermarrying with the natives, adopting their dress and mode of life or becoming connected by fosterhood with such "barbarians." At the same time they made laws to compel the Irish to change their fashions in dress and the wearing of their hair, so that an Englishman who might desire to kill a mere Irishman, "pour passer le temps," might not be betrayed into the mistake of killing one of his own countrymen!

Cambrensis in his own person afforded good illustration of that insolence which his mission to Ireland embodied—the arrogant presumption of the highwayman who would lecture the man who

resisted his attack on his want of good breeding. In the presence of Maurice, Archbishop of Cashel, Cambrensis reproached the Papal Legate, Gerald, for permitting what he styled the indolence of the Irish clergy and the little care they took to instruct the people, thus leading, as he charged, to a decline in their morals. This was part of the deep game which lay at the bottom of his mission to Ireland—a design to make out a case for his master's use and the furtherance of his ambition. As proof of weakness on the religious side he pointed to the fact that none had been known to suffer martyrdom in Ireland for the cause of Christ. The Archbishop replied very quietly that it was true that the Irish people, who were reported to be barbarous, rude, and even cruel, have always behaved with honor and respect to the clergy, and none have been found among them impious enough to raise their hands against the saints of the Lord. If Cambrensis were not thick-headed, like other Anglo-Saxons, he must have winced at this neat retort, for his royal master had not scrupled to get ruffians to raise their hands against a saint, and the agent of the real murderer of Thomas à Becket was the individual who had the effrontery to upbraid the Irish clergy because of the gentleness of their flocks! Surely the force of cynical insolence could no further go. But the Archbishop of Cashel was no less shrewd as a seer than as a satirist, for he added immediately that: "There are among us now men who can make us suffer martyrdom, and Ireland, like other nations, shall henceforward have her martyrs."

It is impossible not to feel the force of that memorable prediction just now, when the cause of the venerable successor of the speaker, the glorious martyr Denis O'Hurley, is so near completion at the Vatican. Cambrensis was the forerunner of the storm of fire and blood that was to crown the efforts of the "philanthropic" murderer, Henry II., for the moral regeneration of the Irish Church and the Irish people.

Amongst the other heads of indictment formulated by Camden, another of the English critics, as reason for having the Irish people at large found guilty of want of civilization was the queer one of uncouthness of language. In writing a description of Westmeath, he mentions the names of chieftains, such as the McLaghlands and the McGeoghehans, which had, to his ears, a barbarous sound. The Irish language appeared to him and other Englishmen a barbarous jargon. When we consider the chaotic condition of things in England at the same period, as regards language, when the vehicle we now call the English language was only in formless embryo, and a ridiculous jumble of Anglo-Norman, Anglo-Saxon and Danish was the mess upon which the tongue was condemned to feed for a

couple of centuries, the sneer at the Irish language shows the rash audacity of extreme ignorance and vain contempt of things unfamiliar, and therefore distasteful.

The Irish had a scientific language—that is, a systematized form of elegant expression, like Greek, for at least two thousand years before the appearance of critics who spoke only a patch-work jargon, like the “lingua franca” of the Mediterranean seaboard, used among mariners of all countries—an ancient form of Esperanto, as we may fairly describe it. In the age of Elizabeth the English speech had been hammered into something like a symmetrical shape, but still it appeared “barbarous” to learned Irishmen. Shane O’Neill, who was a good linguist for his time, declared that he “never could get his tongue around the barbarous English,” and declined to attempt to get the habit of using it. The language, as we know it to-day, was only brought to anything like a civilized vehicle of expression in the eighteenth century, when Addison and Steele and Goldsmith and Johnson had given it form and shown what could be done with the hybrid compound because of its great flexibility and power of assimilation. In the era when the English were passing laws for the extinction of the Irish language, making it a capital offense for any schoolmaster to teach the Irish language, their own tongue was only a struggling jumble.

The truth of the matter seems to be that the social system which the English invaders were bent on annihilating and displacing was much superior to that which they sought to impose. In Ireland, from remote antiquity, a system of equity had been established which has never been enjoyed under the rule of the foreigner. The land was the property of the whole tribe or sept: the prince or chief got his share and no more, nor had he or any one else the right or the power to put the humblest member of the sept out of his dwelling or deprive him of his share of the soil on his mere caprice. There was no such thing as a feudal system; there was no vassalage, no serfdom. Justice was administered by judges trained in the law, according to the venerable Brehon code, and who had to fulfill the most rigorous requirements of examination as to learning and judicial fitness before receiving their appointments. Once appointed, it was not in the power of the chief to deprive them of their office: hence the security that a judge should possess to enable him to render decisions that would command respect was always theirs. The ancient literature of Ireland is full of evidence showing the great respect entertained in all ages for the Brehons or judges and the decisions which they rendered. Sir John Davies, the Attorney General for Ireland under King James I., in his writings on the Brehon Laws, gives the views of enlightened and unpreju-

diced Englishmen on this highly important phase of Irish social order. He wrote:

"For there is no nation of people under the sunne that doth love equall and indifferent justice better than the Irish, or will rest better satisfied with the execution thereof, although it bee against themselves; so as they may have the protection and benefit of the law, when uppon just cause they do desire it."

The foregoing extract is valuable, both for the emphatic expression of opinion given by a great legal and literary authority as well as for the proof afforded by the curious phraseology and spelling of the uncouthness of the English language even at the close of the seventeenth century.

Although the principle of a common right in the soil to all members of a tribe or sept was the original one, in the course of ages modifications grew out of accidental conditions, such as forfeiture of their portions by offenders against the law or persons falling into debt which they were unable to clear off. Hence there arose a class of landless persons, who, though not actually slaves, occupied a somewhat analogous position by being deprived of the privileges of the freemen. Hence when Giraldus Cambrensis went about in Ireland he found enough to justify him in enumerating amongst the causes of the indictment he drew up against the native system the existence of slavery. But he has to make the humiliating confession that it was a common custom at that time amongst the English to sell their children and other relatives as slaves to Irish purchasers. The great slave emporium when he wrote was Bristol, between which port and Irish ports along the southern and eastern coasts there had existed trading intercourse from time immemorial. Hence if there were any justification for King Henry's agent in making the custom of buying slaves a ground for an attack upon the institutions of the Irish Celts, the avowal that the institution of slavery was largely maintained by the unnatural avarice of British parents was no less an indictment—a far more damning one against the country whose superiority in civilization he had been specially despatched to demonstrate by odious comparisons. The slavery that he found in Ireland was much akin to that which existed in the Roman Republic, both in its origin—defaulting debtors and prisoners of war—and the personal disabilities it entailed on the hapless victims of evil fortune. The Irish condition would appear to have been better, though, than the Roman, since there are no allegations of cruelty toward the slaves by their masters, such as shock one at times when turning over the pages of Roman history. The feudal system which Cambrensis represented was at the period when he wrote fully established over England, and in some of its

features was quite as revolting to the humane as actual slavery, as it gave the lord of the soil an absolute right over the person of the serf and over his family.

The land of the chief, held as mensal estate, descended from him not to his heirs, but to the person elected to be his successor by the tribe. This is what was called the law of Tanistry. It was useful in protecting the tribe from the evils of a continuous tyranny, and in giving each member a voice in the government of the tribe and the policy that ought to be adopted toward neighboring tribes. The social order was also unique in the distinction accorded under it to poets, historians and bards. These ranked next to the nobles in the scheme of classification. They were held in high honor. They were held immune from legal assessments, and their residential places were given the privilege of sanctuary to fugitive persons flying from an enemy in times of war. In Christian times this privilege of sanctuary was extended to all the termons, or demesne lands, of churches and monasteries. Such edifices and their demesnes were so many cities of refuge to the tenants as well as fugitives in time of war, and, as they also gave facilities for the storing of property, were an invaluable aid in the preservation of human life and the fruits of civilization in literary and artistic treasures.

An institution of chivalry existed in Ireland from time immemorial. The Knights of the Red Branch, as the brotherhood was called, formed a very noble institution. They were sworn to observe honorable methods in warfare and behave with humanity toward the weak and defenseless. Finally, an army when setting out on a campaign was attended by a corps of doctors and surgeons to look after the wounded. Medicine was an art well known and practiced in Ireland from a remote age. A system of hospitals for public use was maintained over the country long before the coming of the English critic and his congeners.

To men who came with the sole purpose of discovering what was unlovely it was easy enough, in rude times, to find much that might seem to demand censure: the excellences of the Irish social system were not apparent to their distorted vision. The republication of Fynes Moryson's book on travels gives the reading public an opportunity of gauging the depth of the prejudice which prevailed amongst the English people toward Irishmen as late as the close of Elizabeth's reign.

Moryson was an Englishman of property, and as his tastes were of an expensive order, he must have had no stint of money to be able to indulge them as he did. He traveled much, and in remote countries, the Far East and Russia and other distant places.

Traveling in those days was difficult and costly, far beyond what it is now; hence he must have been a man of no small wealth to be able to indulge his tastes. He was also a man of good education, and must have been a tolerable linguist to be able to go about among strange peoples so freely as he did. Amongst the places he visited was that one so grievously misgoverned by his own countrymen, unhappy Ireland. He went there in the capacity of private secretary to one of the worst of its governors, the ferocious Lord Deputy, Mountjoy. This Governor made his fame by "pacifying" the country in the manner described so pithily by the barbarian to the Roman Consul. He made a desert, and then boasted to his mistress, Elizabeth, that he had brought peace to Ireland. The desolation of Munster, after the "pacificator" was done with his work was complete. The crops were destroyed as well as the inhabitants. Most of the adult male population fell on the field, and the caves were filled with trembling women and children, who soon had the horrors of famine to contend with instead of the swords of the ruthless English.

Edmund Spenser, in his letters on the state of Ireland, tells how he saw women and children, driven by hunger, come creeping out of caves and eating grass for want of other food, and how some of the women, insane from the pangs of starvation, actually killed and ate their own offspring. Such was the work which Fynes Moryson's chief set out for Munster to execute, and such the work he subsequently carried out in the North as well as in the South. As an historian or observer he is not to be trusted, any more than Cambrensis, Spenser, Camden or any of the others who visited Ireland for the purpose of enriching themselves at the expense of the inhabitants and of painting their morals and habits in the darkest colors for the ignoble purpose of excusing the cruelties to which the English invaders subjected them.

It is singular that some Irishmen of national proclivities were to be found joining with the renegade Irish who joined "the garrison" in giving credence to the writings of Moryson. Mr. Henry Parnell, a member of the Irish Parliament and a man of letters, may be pointed to as an illustration of this extraordinary fatuity. In the preface to his book, above referred to, he observes:

"It is scarcely credible that in a climate like that of Ireland, and at a period so far advanced in civilization as the end of Elizabeth's reign, the greater part of the natives should go naked. Yet this is rendered certain by the testimony of an eye-witness, Fynes Moryson."

In his work on travel, now republished, Moryson states that, in Ireland in his period, not only men and women of the ordinary sort go naked, save for a strip of linen about the loins and a loose mantle

open in the front, but also the chiefs. He does not say their wives, but he allows it to be inferred that these were equally indifferent to weather and modesty. But, as if fearful that such a statement might be too much for even English readers, he goes on to cite the evidence of "a Bohemian baron" (name not given) coming from Scotland by the North of Ireland. "He told me," Moryson says, "with great earnestness, that he, coming to the house of O'Kane, a great lord among them, was met at the door by sixteen women, all naked, excepting their loose mantles. . . . They led him into the house, and there, sitting down by the fire, like tailors, desired him to sit down with them." Then this Bohemian baron is said to have told Moryson that O'Kane, the lord of the country, came in all naked, too, save for a mantle and shoes, and "in his best manner in the Latin tongue" desired him to take off his clothes and sit naked like the company.

Here is an extraordinary anomaly! A man who is described as "barbarous" able to speak Latin so well as to use it in ordinary conversation with an utter stranger. The women of Ireland were renowned for modesty, but Fynes Moryson was able to make learned Irishmen like Mr. Parnell believe that they had discarded that beautiful cloak, for he adds that the women in O'Kane's castle sat around the fire in such a fashion "as could not but offend chaste eyes." Furthermore, he says that "men and women, at night, going to sleep, lye thus naked in a round circle about the fire, with their feet towards it. They fold their heads and their upper parts in woollen mantles, first steeped in water to keep them warm, for they say that woollen cloth, wetted, preserves heat (as linen, wetted, preserves cold) when the smoke of their bodies has warmed the woollen cloth."

In similar unconscionable fashion Edmund Spenser set to work to traduce the women of the South of Ireland, going farther even than the anonymous "Bohemian baron" in his imputations on Irish female chastity. He describes in his work called "A View of the State of Ireland" the garb of the Irish women of his time. He says that a large over-mantle was the principal article, and that this covering served many purposes by day and night for the class that he styles "mona shul"—something like wandering mendicants. We can readily believe that Munster was overrun by such a class at the period when he wrote, for more than four centuries of warfare had reduced the manhood of the country to a mere handful and left the widowed and orphaned to eke out an existence by whatever shifts they could. The "mona shul," he says, used their ample mantles to conceal their immoral behavior—a stupid and ridiculous attempt at defamation, as any one may plainly perceive. His actual

language, in so describing the women, is so abominable that we do not feel justified in giving it here.

That the Irish were pious Catholics not one of the calumniating English chroniclers attempts to deny—nay, they rather make the fact a powerful argument for the persecutions which they encouraged and helped to foment. How, then, could they reconcile their piety with the glaring immodesty and immorality which they also laid at their door? Let us look at an incident that took place in Ulster about the very same period of which Fynes Moryson and Edmund Spenser were writing—the end of Elizabeth's reign. Hugh O'Donnell—"dauntless Red Hugh" of the song—was in the field measuring swords against Elizabeth's favorite, the fiery Devereux, Earl of Essex. Essex was cooped up in Cork, hemmed in by the O'Connors, the MacCarthy More's and the Earl of Desmond's army. But he got Clifford, the Governor of Connaught, to move toward Ulster to attack O'Donnell, who was moving to join forces with the armies besieging him in Cork. O'Donnell did not wait for Clifford to attack, but sallied out to meet him, and came up with his vanguard near the Curlew Mountains, outside Boyle. It was the eve of Lady Day. O'Donnell ordered a fast as a preparation for the battle, and that all his men go to confession and communion. In addressing his warriors he said: "As we have already often defeated the reformers through the help of the Blessed Virgin Mary, we have reason to hope for similar success this day. Yesterday we fasted in honor of the Virgin: this day we celebrate her festival, and thus let us combat her enemies and we will be the conquerors." Is it to be supposed that a people animated by such a beautiful spirit of devotion could be the barbarous savages that Sydney Smith, misled by Spenser and Moryson, believed them to be? Is it to be imagined that a state of society such as these writers depicted was capable of producing generals and soldiers capable of defeating Sir Conyers Clifford ignominiously, as O'Donnell did that day, and as Hugh O'Neill did on a couple of other not less memorable days when he crossed swords respectively with Marshal Bagenal and General Monroe? The battles of the Yellow Ford, the Pass of Plumes and the Curlew Mountains were amongst the most brilliant military achievements of a martial age, and it was Irish genius and Irish gallantry that, under God, were able to bring them about. Essex himself confessed the superiority of the Irish. "The men are stronger," he wrote to his royal mistress, "and they handle their arms with more skill than our people: they differ from us also in point of discipline." Are these points of superiority over veteran and disciplined armies the marks of an inferior civilization? we might ask any fair-minded reader.

In the year 1644 a book was published in Ireland describing what a French traveler, M. de la Boullaye le Gonz, had noted during a sojourn in Ireland only a few years after Spenser and Moryson had published their attacks upon the Irish because of their costume. He described the dress of "the Irish whom the English call savages." "Their breeches are a pantaloon of white frieze, which they call trousers; and for mantles they have five or six yards of frieze drawn round the neck, the body and over the head. The women wear a very large mantle, the cape being made of coarse woollen frieze, in the manner of the women of Lower Normandy." Dr. Massari, Dean of Fermo, who accompanied Cardinal Rinuccini as secretary on his mission to Ireland, kept a journal, in which, amongst other subjects, he described the dress of the women he saw there. Their costume, he wrote, somewhat resembles the French mode. "All wear cloaks," he wrote, "with long fringes; they have also a hood sewn to the cloak, and they go abroad without any other covering for the head; some wearing a kerchief as the Greek women do." Sir William Petty, a noted surveyor of the seventeenth century, wrote amongst other works a book called "The Political Anatomy of Ireland," in the course of which he says: "The diet, housing and clothing of the sixteen thousand families who are computed to have more than one chimney in their houses is much the same as in England; nor is the French elegance unknown in many of them, nor the French and Latin tongues, the latter whereof is very frequent amongst the poorest Irish, and chiefly in Kerry, most remote from Dublin." Linen vests were commonly worn by the better classes in Pagan times, as may be seen from the old writings; and in the fifteenth century much "linen cloth falding" was imported into Chester and Brabant from Irish houses, as old entries show. A habit of extravagance in their use of linen was indeed one of the grounds of complaint made against the Irish upper classes, and some legislation seeking to check it was even enacted in the year 1537, providing that no shirt should contain more than seven yards. The unknown author of this precious piece of lawmaking was even more ridiculous than the later Irish legislator who introduced a bill to enact that "every quart bottle should hold a quart."

Enough has been said, perhaps, to show that if Edmund Spenser, Fynes Moryson and the anonymous "Bohemian baron" did really see what has been partially described above (for, indeed, the actual description is in parts so indecent that we could not, without offense to our readers, reproduce its text), the cases must have been exceptional and the conditions the natural result of long-continued warfare and frequent famines upon the oppressed people. War

has always a brutalizing effect, as well on women sometimes as on men, and the scanty attire described may have been the result of some peculiarly harsh conditions. But as for the story about the immodest behavior of O'Kane's household, we say flatly that it is an invention, no matter how many Bohemian barons swore to it; and we say the same of Fynes Moryson's statement that he himself had a similar experience. The fact that he gives no names of persons or places where he says he had the experience puts his story on precisely the same plane as that of his Bohemian nobleman; and the entire passage may be ranked for veracity along with the story of "The Bohemian Girl" in the opera.

Let us take a glance at the state of civilization in England and Scotland in the same epoch, or a little earlier and a little later, as those traducers of Ireland chose for their onslaughts. Let us begin with the reign of Edward the Third. That king had a splendid court, and was surrounded constantly by the flower of English chivalry. He had won the tremendous victory of Crecy over the French and had overthrown the Scots under David Bruce. "The king," says the historian Green, "who was a model of chivalry in his dealings with knight and noble, showed himself a brutal savage to the burgesses of Calais. Even the courtesy to his queen, which threw a halo over the story of their deliverance, went hand in hand with a constant disloyalty to her. When once Philippa was dead his profligacy threw all shame aside. He paraded a mistress as Queen of Beauty through the streets of London, and set her in pomp over tournaments as the Lady of the Sun. The nobles were quick to follow their lord's example. 'In those days,' writes a chronicler of the time, 'arose a rumor and clamor among the people that wherever there was a tournament there came a great concourse of ladies, of the most costly and beautiful, but not of the best in the kingdom, sometimes forty and fifty in number, as if they were a part of the tournament—ladies clad in diverse and wonderful male apparel, in parti-colored tunics, with short capes and bands wound cordwise around their heads, and girdles bound with gold and silver, and daggers in pouches across their bodies. And thus they rode on choice coursers to the place of tourney, and so spent and wasted their goods and vexed their bodies with scurrilous wantonness that the murmurs of the people sounded everywhere. But they neither feared God nor blushed at the chaste voice of the people.' The establishment in 1346 of the Order of the Garter, in the new castle that Edward was raising at Windsor, marked the highest reach of the spurious "chivalry" of the day."

The scandalous abandonment of public decency that England then beheld would appear to have provoked Divine wrath, as while

the saturnalia was in full swing there came the most awful visitation England had ever staggered under. This was the plague known as the Black Death—probably the same pestilence we now call cholera. It swept away half the population; and in its wake came famine, for there was no one to till the fields or gather the harvest.

That Mr. Green was entirely justified in referring to the age “when knighthood was in flower” as one of “spurious chivalry” is not merely corroborated by the case of Edward’s brutality at Calais and his debauchery in Windsor, but by other examples elsewhere. His son, “the Black Prince,” as he was called, is commonly held up as the very paragon of knighthood and honor. After the victory of the English at Crecy the Black Prince was sent into Guienne, as he had no money to pay his army, and to give the country over to the troops for spoliation as an equivalent for pay. Up the Garonne the prince led his army of freebooters, into a country that had not known war for centuries before, and the mansions of the great and the cottages of the poor were soon stripped of everything valuable or useful. The marauders sacked Carcassone and Narbonne, and returned to Bordeaux laden with rich plunder and glutted with indulgence of the worst passions of a victorious horde—“a disgraceful success,” as the historian we have quoted justly terms the achievement. What a mockery of the laws of chivalry—a war upon a defenseless people and a pastoral country totally unprepared and unexpectant of a visitation! When the English armies crossed the border into Scotland, or the Pale in Ireland, they knew they were sure to encounter at some stage of their advance a worthy foe, able to give blow for blow. But in the descent upon the fields and farmhouses of Guienne there was no likelihood of an encounter with an enemy capable of offering resistance. It was merely, therefore, a promenade of loot and ravage that the Black Prince undertook—a most ignoble set-off to the brilliant and stunning performance of the same leader at Crecy. Hence it is no wonder that the historian refers to the theatrical knighthood of the period of Edward and his son as a spurious chivalry.

Having culled one or two illustrations of the ideals of civilization prevalent in England when Ireland was being held up as barbarous, let us now turn for a moment to what prevailed north of the Tweed, about the same epoch. It is inconceivable that if the Rev. Sydney Smith had devoted adequate consideration to the social state of Scotland, such as we find it cursorily depicted in Chambers’ “Social History” of that country, he could have honestly concluded that the Irish people in the reign of Queen Elizabeth were entitled to the palm for barbarity in their mode of living. In Scotland it was for several centuries a case of house against house and clan

against clan. These feuds were sustained by mutual deeds of savagery frequently descending to the medieval Italian level. Mr. Chambers gives many particulars regarding them, all taken from unimpeachable sources. Let us take a glance at one example, taken from King's "*Antiqua Monumenta*." A celebrated Scotch astronomer, James Ferguson, was the guest for some months at Castle Dounie, the ancestral seat of Lord Lovat, a turbulent noble of the eighteenth century—more than one hundred years after the period referred to by Fynes Moryson. It was a large building, but comfortless. Ferguson says the nobleman received his company and kept public table, after the manner of a petty court, in the room where he slept; and the only place his lady had was, also, her bedroom! The servants and retainers had nothing but straw, spread on the four lower apartments of the house. About four hundred persons would often thus be kennelled together; and Ferguson says that of these wretched dependents he had often seen three or four, and sometimes half a dozen, hung upon trees, by the heels, for hours, outside the mansion, to expiate petty offenses. At the tables, which ran along the length of the great hall, the better class of retainers or guests were served with beef and mutton and a glass of port; the next rank had sheep's head and a glass of whisky; and the lowest hangers-on had to be content with the leavings of the more favored.

In his early days Lord Lovat had abducted a lady of the Frasers, a relative—for he was a Fraser—and forcibly married her. The mode of the nuptials is peculiarly illustrative of the manners of the time. It was described in the record of the judicial proceedings which were instituted by the lady's family shortly after the abduction. It sets out thus:

"The said Captain Simon Fraser takes up the most mad and villainous resolution that ever was heard of, for all in a sudden he and his said accomplices make the lady close prisoner under his armed guards, and then come upon her with three or four ruffians in the night time, and, having dragged out her maids, he proposes to the lady that she should marry him; and when she fell in lamenting and crying, the great pipe was blown up to drown her cries and the wicked villains ordered the minister to proceed. The lady fainted, but the great bagpipe was blown up as formerly, and the foresaid ruffians rent off her clothes, cutting her stays with their dirks, and so thrust her into bed."

Those who have read Sir Walter Scott's poems will recall the many superstitious practices of the Highlanders, noble as well as clansman, that he weaves into his magic robe of romance. These were not imaginary. Macaulay tells how the clansmen of the

MacCallum More, Argyll, were summoned to meet him in muster at the island of Tarbet when he headed the rebellion against James II., the signal being the sending out of the fiery cross, as described in "The Lady of the Lake." Argyll was a Scotch Presbyterian, but he did not hesitate to use a rite which Macaulay contemptuously scoffs at as "half Popish and half pagan." The cross, made from a bough of yew, was first set on fire, and then quenched in the blood of a sacrificial goat. It was venerated or dreaded as a sacred token, a message that no true clansman dare disregard when shown him by the running messenger sent out by the chief of his tribe.

In considering this picture of a Highland Chief's establishment, we must bear in mind that Lord Lovat was a Jacobite and a Catholic, and the writer a bitter Presbyterian. Lord Lovat was terribly hated because of his daring and the impossibility of capturing him, no matter how high the price that was offered for him dead or alive. He served afterwards for many years in the French Court, as a diplomat and statesman, and was a man of high literary distinction and scholarship. This disparity between environment and attainments was not greater in his case than in that of the Irish chiefs.

It is not strange, observes Macaulay, that the "Wild Scotch," as they were sometimes called, should in the seventeenth century have been considered by the Saxons as mere savages. By no means strange indeed, since nearly all outsiders were so considered by the egotistical Britons. They had been held up as savages by English rulers from the days of Mrs. Afra Behn to those of Dr. Johnson. Even Oliver Goldsmith, who was a fairly impartial Irish writer, joined in the discordant chorus. The writings in which these denunciations were published were well known to the Rev. Sydney Smith. Why, then, did he, in a Scotch magazine, attempt to give the palm for savagery to the Irish of the sixteenth century, when a century later his own countrymen and others had unanimously awarded it to the Scotch? Even the Scottish Lowlanders agreed in branding the Highlanders. In the "History of the Revolution in Scotland," published in Edinburgh in 1690, they are described:

"The Highlanders of Scotland are a sort of wretches that have no other consideration of honor, friendship, obedience or government than as, by any alteration of affairs or revolution in the government, they can improve to themselves an opportunity of robbing or plundering their bordering neighbors."

Mrs. Afra Behn, in a volume of Miscellanies published by her in 1685, which is equal in dirty language to any part of Rabelais, quotes from an old Lowland Scotch song some verses about the

making of the first Highlander to prove that stealing was his first impulse as well as ruling passion. Other Scotch writers of the Lowlands entertained the same opinion, and expressed it, but not so disgustingly as the English "lady" of the Restoration period. These facts ought to have weighed with the Rev. Sydney Smith, but, strangely enough, though living in the midst of books and libraries in the city that was proudly called "the Northern Athens," he altogether overlooked them.

But, after all, savagery is comparative and a matter of custom, ideals and geography. Edmund Spenser was a poet, living among a most poetical people, yet he found little but savagery in them and their bardic epics. He was an Englishman, and that fact colored his poetry and his views of a stranger race whom he neither could or would understand, and he regarded their speech as well as their poetry as barbarous, although in truth it was immeasurably purer and nobler than his own. Mrs. Afra Behn was an Englishwoman, and she brings forward as proof of Scottish savagery specimens of filthy speech. She had proved her fitness to be an "arbiter elegantiarum" by herself writing some of the foulest compositions that English literature contains. A French writer, not knowing the sex of the author, and reading some of her works, might be justified in describing them as that of a lascivious savage. Voltaire described Shakespeare's productions as those of "a drunken savage." Hence thoughtful people, as clergymen generally should be, might hesitate to accept the testimony of interested parties on the claims of people whom their governments had wronged as to the level of civilization these people had attained when their conquest and spoliation was the direct object in view.

But the Rev. Sydney Smith meant well. He was an honest friend of Ireland, and championed her cause. If Ireland were as savage as Fynes Moryson described her, he attributed that fact to the long course of penal laws and plunder that his countrymen had subjected Irishmen to. Therefore we may forgive him.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

IRISH NAMES IN COLONIAL MILITARY HISTORY.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for January, 1906, contained an interesting article by the late Bryan J. Clinch, entitled "Irish Names and Their Changes." The special object of the writer of the article was to throw light upon the volume of Irish blood contributed to our composite American people, and incidentally to provoke inquiry into that subject. Mr. Clinch indicated his purpose in the second sentence of the article, thus: "There are good grounds for thinking that the Irish Celts are the largest numerical element in the mixed population of our land, and family names are a valuable historical help in examining the question scientifically."

He then showed how a large number of unmistakable Celtic names had been more or less transformed by law and by various forms of spelling. The article was especially interesting to the present writer for the reason that he had been scanning for several years the annual volume as it appeared of a serial publication compiled from the State archives of Massachusetts, and published by the Secretary of State pursuant to an order passed by the Legislature in the year 1891. The work is entitled "Massachusetts Soldiers and Sailors of the Revolutionary War." The sixteenth volume appeared a few weeks ago, completing the rolls alphabetically up to and including probably half the names beginning with the letter "W." The volumes are large octavo, and each contains at least one thousand pages. They contain the name of every man recruited in Massachusetts for land or naval service during the Revolution.

On these rolls are to be found material for profound surprise to those who are under the prevailing impression that the population of the Massachusetts province during the Revolution was composed practically of people of English blood. Consciously or unconsciously, that impression has been fostered carefully and cultivated by writers to whom the Puritan cult was the fount of civil and religious liberty in America, if not throughout the world. As an evidence of that, Mr. Palfrey, one of the leading historians of New England, in the preface to his five-volume edition, "The History of New England," published in 1858, informs the reader that "the people of New England are a singularly unmixed race. There is probably not a county in England occupied by a population of purer English blood than them. . . . A hundred and twenty Scotch Irish families came over in 1719 and settled at Londonderry, in New Hampshire, and elsewhere. Great numbers of foreigners (especially of Irish and, next to them, Germans) are now to be reckoned in the census of New England, but it is chiefly within the

last thirty years that they have come, and they remain for the most part unamalgamated with the population of English descent." It may be worthy of note to observe that this remark by Mr. Palfrey was made when the Knownothing party was most vigorous throughout the country, and had secured the election of a Governor in Massachusetts.

It may be worth while to give another instance of how this legend has been cultivated. Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, the senior United States Senator from Massachusetts, gravely informs us in the first volume of his "Story of the Revolution," a work published in 1898, that the people of Massachusetts were "of almost pure English blood, with a small infusion of Huguenots and a slight mingling, chiefly in New Hampshire, of Scotch Irish from Londonderry." Mr. Palfrey is dead many years ago, but Mr. Lodge is living. Right here it will serve to state that, according to the Revolutionary records of Massachusetts, fourteen men named Palfrey, under the various forms of spelling that name, served in the Revolutionary ranks, while there are to be found not less than nineteen Learys. Not a solitary man named Lodge appears on these muster rolls, but there are to be found at least sixty-nine Larkins.

Before proceeding to apprise the reader of the amazing number of distinctively Irish names presented by these official records, it may be observed that the total population of the Massachusetts Bay province, slaves and freemen, black and white, Whigs and Tories, men, women and children, in the year 1776, according to the provincial census taken that year, was 299,841. Now, with that number of population borne in mind, we will glance at some of the unmistakable Celtic names on these rolls. Family names common to various countries, such as White, Black, Brown, Green, Smith and some others, will be passed over, although several of these on the rolls have such very suggestive surnames as Patrick, Michael, Bartholomew, John, James, Timothy, etc., while the Puritan surnames were generally those of the Hebrew lawgivers and prophets.

It may be instructive to observe that Robert Louis Stevenson, in the delightful sketch which he made in reference to whether or not his own name was originally Celtic, Norse or Saxon, makes the following enlightening statement: "A great Highland clan uses the name of Robertson, a sept in Appin that of Livingstone. Mac-Clean in Glencoe answers to Johnstone at Lockerby. There is but one rule to be deduced: that however uncompromisingly Saxon their name may appear, you can never be sure it does not designate a Celt." Stevenson seems to incline to the opinion that his name was originally in another form, Scottish Celtic.

These Massachusetts records furnish no proof as to the birth-

place or residence of probably a majority of the men's names borne upon them. In some instances the nationality is given, in others the residence. The editor, Colonel Olin, Secretary of State, in giving the commonly accepted form of spelling a name, indicates the various forms of spelling the same name, which appear in the proper alphabetical order. Thus, here is a precise transcript relating to the name Ahern as it appears in the first volume: "Ahern. This name also appears under the form of Aharn, Ahen, Ahzen." And then follows the record of the first Ahern, thus: "Ahern, Timothy. Private; Captain Nathaniel Cushing's Co. Col. Joseph Vose's Regt.; Muster Rolls for Jan., Feb., March and April, 1779, dated Providence; also list of deserters from Col. Joseph Vose's 1st regt., date Camp Highland, July 13, 1780; birthplace, Ireland. Age, twenty-eight years; stature, five ft. four in.; complexion, dark; hair, brown."

Six Aherns in its various forms appear on the list. They are followed by twenty-one Barrys and several Berrys. Of the latter, some are recorded as of Irish nationality. In the letter B catalogue a curious discovery is to be made, in view of the statements made by Palfrey, Lodge and others in reference to the Scotch Irish contribution to the population. It is that a corps of Irish volunteers served Massachusetts in the Revolutionary days. This is the official record:

"Brother, Martin. Private; list of men known as Irish volunteers. Service from Sept. 18, 1780, to Oct. 10, 1780, at Machias, under Col. John Allen."

The Scotch Irish myth had not yet been invented. Among the Browns it may be said there are four Michaels, eleven Peters, four Patricks, and a note attached to the record of one of the latter runs: "Reported foreigner." The spelling of some names is very peculiar.

Thus: Patrick Buckhannon, evidently Buchannan, most probably Irish or Scotch, is recorded as a corporal in Captain Heath's company, Colonel Gerrishe's regiment, while a man called Timothy Buggy, of Captain Cook's company, Colonel Porter's regiment, is thus described: "Age, forty; stature, 5 ft. 11 in.; complexion, dark; residence, Hadley; nationality, Irish."

The Burkes, under the various forms of that name, from Bourke to Burks, furnished seventy-nine men to the fighting line. One of these Burkes bears the curious surname "Africa," although not recorded as a Colored man, while following him appears Sergeant Anthony Burk, whose nationality is said to be Irish. There was a Sergeant Patrick Burk, whose residence is given as Boston and also Ireland, and who is described as an orderly to the General. There was one Elijah, one Jesse, one Jonah, four Josiahs, one Silas

and eleven Johns among the Burkes. Seven Bradys and sixty-one Burns appear. Among the latter there is one Patrick who enlisted from the town of Northampton, and another Patrick who served as artillery man, without any given residence. A numerous crowd are the Butlers, making a total of one hundred and eighty, quite a number being recorded as of Irish birth. The Callahans number four, the Kanes number thirty-nine and the Canons thirty-three. Forty fighting men of the Careys were enrolled, among whom one is to be found bearing the singular name of Syphax. Carroll, in its various forms, appears eighty-four times. Then follow the Collins, with a magnificent contingent of one hundred and fifty-eight recruits, while the Connollys back them up with thirty-four, and the Connors are supporting them with forty-three.

We now come to the name Corcoran. The compiler says that it is to be found under the form of Cochran, Cochrin, Corcorin and other forms. The first on this list is Patrick Corcoran, who was mustered in at Boston, January 19, 1777, for a term of three years; the next is a Patrick Corcorin, a corporal in Colonel Tupper's regiment, and the next is Patrick Corcoring, residence Boston, who enlisted in Captain Taylor's company. Twenty Corcorans at least are to be found. We find a goodly number of Costellos, with other forms of the name Costilo, Costileo, etc.

Costigan was spelled in various ways by the enlisting officers. It appears in the form of Costekin, Castiken, Castican and Castiken. In like manner we find Cosgrove, which appears as Cosgriff and Cosgrift. Under the name Cowen a numerous body appears, among whom are to be found four Patricks, while under the form of Cowin there are two Patricks, and there is also one Patrick Cowing. The Dalys furnished a quota of thirty-eight, while the Dolans numbered eight, one of the latter being Patrick Doolan, of the Berkshire county contingent. The name Donahoe appears with eleven different forms of spelling, such as Donahew, Donnø-hew, Dunahu, etc.

The Dorans rallied eighteen recruits, and the Donnellys thirty-three, and the Driscolls, under the various forms of spelling their name, contributed twenty. The Doyles numbered thirty-eight, the Donnells forty-three and the Donovans fourteen. Quite a number of Donegans and Duffs are to be found on the record in curious forms of spelling. Among the Duffys we are informed that one Patrick Duffy, of Boston, was a seaman on the ship Protector, and that Dan Duffy was a marine of the ship Alfred, commanded by Captain Paul Jones. Duggan appears as Douggan, Dugen, Duggins and otherwise. We also find the suggestive names of Flagerty, Flagherty, Flaugherty, Flaghtlery, etc.

Fitzgerald appears no less than sixty-nine times, under such curious forms as Michael Fetchcharld, of Haverhill; John Fitch Jeril, of Woburn; Michael Fitchgereld, of Bridgewater; Patrick William Fitz, of Salem; John Fitts Gerel, etc. Forty-one Flemings were at the front, backed up by twenty-nine Flynns. Flynn is spelled all the way from the phonetic form, Flin, to Fling. The Gleasons furnished a good-sized battalion, with one hundred and forty men. And there are Flanagens, Flaninghan, Flannighan and Flarnegan.

The Higgins matched the Gleasons with an equal number of men, one hundred and forty. One Peter Higgins, who enlisted in Boston, was rated as a gunner on the sloop *Machias Liberty*, commanded by Captain Jeremiah O'Brien, and one Levi Higgins was a "second lieutenant in Captain Sullivan's company of volunteers." Eighty-three Harts were in the ranks, and seventy-four Kennedys, one hundred and sixty-seven Kellys, ninety-two Kenneys, twenty-six Keefes and ten Leahys. The Larkins contributed sixty-nine men, and it may be noticed outside the military line that it was Deacon John Larkin, of the Charlestown church, who furnished the horse that carried Paul Revere on his memorable midnight ride to arouse the farmers of Middlesex county to the fact that the British were marching to Lexington and Concord.

Seventy-four Hughes were in line. The Mahans supplied eighteen men, while among the ten Mahoneys there were four surnamed Patrick. Maloney, Moloney, Meloney and other forms of that name appear to the number of fifty-four. Fifteen McGees are recorded, among them being four Patricks, three Peters, one Neil, one Michael and two Davids. McGraths and McGra are visible. Upon the list of McGuire the first name is spelled McGuiar, the succeeding one McGuier, and the last on the list is Timothy McGwyre. Other McGuires appear under the form of McGayre, Macwire, McQuire, and we can also find a Patrick McGuiris, who served as a member of the crew of the armed ship *Deane* in November, 1780. The list of McMahons is a large one of varied spelling, such as McMahone, McMain, McMann, McMehone, etc. The first McMahan on the roll is surnamed James, who enlisted for three years from Londonderry, New Hampshire, the very place from which Senator Lodge says "a sprinkling of Scotch Irish was the contribution." This James McMahan's occupation is given as a weaver, and his birthplace is said to be Ireland. The next McMahan on the roll is another James, who enlisted for the war in Boston, and who is "reported as belonging to Ireland; also reported killed." The McManus turned out a strong quota, and they were powerfully supported by the Mullens and McMullens.

Patrick McMayr, who enlisted in Boston, is hard to classify, owing to the evident misspelling of the family name. We find, however, close by a Patrick McMerry, who enlisted for the war on February 19, 1799, and who is reported as "belonging to Ireland." Another Patrick McMerry is credited to the town of Topsfield from 1777 to December 31, 1779.

The McNamaras make up a large list, running through a variety of forms, such as McNamar, McNamor, McNimarra, Micknamarra, etc. The Murphys rallied a good company of eighty men, with such choice specimens of spelling as Murphe, Morphey, Morfey, and such like. Among these Murphys there are found several saints' names common in Ireland, as well as a few Hebrew surnames. There are fourteen Johns, seven Patricks, five Toms, five Jims, two Mikes, two Tims, two Israels, one Cato, one Lemuel and one Lambeth among the fighting Murphys.

The McCarthys turned out to the number of forty-two, under various forms of spelling, running from McCarte to McLarty. Behind them come eleven McSweeneys under various forms. When we turn to O'Brien, under its various forms—O'Brian, O'Brion, O'Bryan, Obrine, Obrien, Obrian, Brien, Brian, Briant, Bryant and others—we find no less than three hundred and sixty-six men.

Here is the record from Volume II. in reference to Captain Jeremiah O'Brien, of Machias, who fought the first naval battle of the Revolution in Machias Bay, five days before the Battle of Bunker Hill, an event which Fenimore Cooper, in his "Naval History of the United States," designates as "the Lexington of the sea."

"Obrian, Jeremiah. Capt., Sloop Machias Liberty; list of officers of armed vessels; commissioned March 15, 1766; also petition dated Boston, August 12, 1777, signed by Daniel Martin in behalf of himself and others, owner of the schooner Resolution, privateer, asking that said Obrian be commissioned as commander of said vessel; ordered in Council August 13 that a commission be issued; also petition dated Boston, Sept. 8, 1780, signed by John O'Brien, of Newburyport, asking that said Jeremiah Obrian be commissioned as commander of the ship Hannabal, privateer; order in Council Sept. 8, 1780, that a commission be issued."

Such is the simple record of Captain Jeremiah O'Brien, in whose memory the torpedo boat O'Brien was named by the Hon. John D. Long when Secretary of the Navy some years ago. Captain O'Brien's latest biographer, the Rev. Andrew M. Sherman, writing of him in his work printed in 1802, says: "To Jeremiah O'Brien, of Machias, Maine, unquestionably belongs a peculiar honor of having been the Yankee commander in the first naval engagement

resulting in the first victory of the war of the American Revolution, and of having subsequently commanded, in connection with the same war, the first American armed cruiser and the first American flying squadron."

Serving under Captain O'Brien in this first fight in Machias Bay were his five brothers. One of his biographers informs us that it was "only with some difficulty his father Maurice, then sixty years of age, was deterred from his purpose to accompany them on that perilous enterprise." At least two of Captain Jeremiah's brothers held commissions on armed ships during the Revolution. And, as might be expected, the roll of O'Briens contains a heavy sprinkling of Pats, Mikes, Jerrys and Johns, although some are recorded with surnames such as Lemuel, Abraham, Levi and other Old Testament names so fashionable among the Godly Puritans.

O'Neill, in the form Oneal, O'Nall, O'Niel, Neil, Neall, etc., appears to the number of forty-eight. Among these are Patrick Neale, and close by is Patrick Neaf, probably a misspelled name. There are few O'Donahys, one being a corporal in Captain Charles Parson's company. O'Donnell appears seven times with a prefix O', while the Donnells, already referred to, numbered forty-three. There are two O'Haras, two Ohearns, one O'Herrin, one Ohogan and three O'Connors. Connor, Connar, etc., have been already noticed.

The Ryans, under such forms as Rion, Ryon, Ryans, etc., mustered a good company, amounting to ninety-two. The Sheas, under various pellings, such as Sha, Shay, Shey and Shays, count up a total of twenty-four, including two Patrick Shays. Shields, from the phonetic form Sheels to Shiels, number eighteen. Sheehan is well represented. There was a Dan Sheehan of the crew of the armed ship Rambler; Patrick Shehane, of Colonel Craft's regiment; Patrick Shehean, an artillerist, and Patrick Shehin, who enlisted in 1776 to serve in the Continental army during the war.

Sullivan, under the forms of Sulavan, Sulleven, Sullivent, Sulloven, Sullivin, is found to the number of fifty-seven. Here is the brief reference to General Sullivan while under the military jurisdiction of Massachusetts: "Sullivan (John). General order, dated Headquarters, Cambridge, July 22, 1775, making disposition of the forces about Boston and dividing the army into three grand divisions to consist of two brigades each; said Sullivan, Brigadier-general, assigned to the command of a brigade which was to form part of left wing, or second division, of the army under Major-general Lee, and to be stationed at Winter Hill."

The Tobins turned out twenty-five strong. Among these are three Patrick Tobins, one Patrick Toban, one Patrick Toben and a

Patrick Toborn. Only three Toomeys appear. Walsh appears under the form of Walch, Welch, Welsh, etc. They make a very large contingent, among whom the surnames of Patrick, Paul, Peter, Joseph, John and Dennis are to be found. We find John Welch credited at Boston, whose birthplace is given as Ireland, while Patrick Welch, who is described as red-haired, has no birthplace given, but simply his residence as Boston. But Patrick Welsh, credited to Plymouth county, whose complexion was dark, is recorded as a resident of Plymouth.

The names just selected are a few of the distinctively Irish names about which there can be scarcely a doubt. Fitzgerald was not originally a Celtic name, but by right of Irish birth for over seven centuries, and its absorption into the national life, it may be fairly claimed as Irish. So also with the names Barry and Burke. It may be observed that the writer in giving the total number of men of any of the given names is never over the mark, rather under it. As the search through these volumes of any specific name has often been made in widely separated portions of one or two or more volumes, owing to the different forms of spelling and the strict alphabetical order of printing the record carried out by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, it can be truthfully said that the number is not exaggerated.

It may be further observed that these distinctively Irish names compare quite favorably in point of number with the best-known English names on the rolls. Certainly this is more than a little surprising in the face of the carefully cultivated story that Massachusetts up to the beginning of the last decade of the first half of the nineteenth century was composed almost exclusively of people of English blood. The official record of the men who defended Massachusetts in the Revolutionary days on land and sea tells a different story. And a curious commentary that story is upon the old legend illustrated by Senator Lodge's bold assertion in his "Story of the Revolution," printed in 1898, that the people of Massachusetts in the Revolutionary War were "almost pure Englishmen, with a small infusion of Huguenots and a slight mingling, chiefly in New Hampshire, of Scotch Irish from Londonderry."

When did all these fighting men of Celtic name come into Massachusetts? That query involves another story, which the present writer will not now enter upon, save in a general way. It may be remarked that an intimate intercourse between Ireland and the Massachusetts Bay colonies commenced during the Cromwellian period—that is to say, as early as 1646, in the very infancy of the colony. How intimate this intercourse was may be gathered in part from Mr. Prendergast's authoritative work, "The Crom-

wellian Settlement of Ireland," which presents for the first time extracts from the State papers of Cromwell's commissioners for the affairs of Ireland.

Prendergast says: "In the early part of the year 1651, when the country, by their own description (Cromwell's commissioners) to the Council of State, was a scene of unparalleled waste and ruin, the commissioners for Ireland affectionately urged Mr. Harrison, then a minister of the Gospel in New England, to come over to Ireland, which he would find experimentally was a comfortable seed plot (so they said) for his labors. . . . It was their chief care to plant Ireland with a Godly seed and generation. Mr. Harrison was unable to come, but some movement appears to have been made towards a plantation from America, as proposals were received in January, 1655, for the planting of the town of Sligo and lands thereabouts with families from New England; and lands on the Mile Line, together with the two little islands called Oyster Island and Coney Island, were leased for one year, from the 10th of April, 1655, for the use of such English families as should come from New England, in order to their transplantation. In 1656 several families arriving from New England at Limerick had the excise of tobacco brought with them for the use of themselves and families remitted; and other families in May and July of that year, who had come over from New England to plant, were received as tenants of State lands near Garristown, in the County of Dublin, about fifteen miles north of the capital. . . . They, the commissioners, had agents actively employed through Ireland seizing women, orphans and the destitute, to be transported to Barbadoes and the English plantations in America."

During Puritan control in Ireland ships passed frequently between ports of the Massachusetts Bay and Irish ports, carrying freight and willing and unwilling passengers. In 1654 the ship *Goodfellow*, Captain George Dell, arrived in the port of Boston with merchandise and a large number of Irish, who were sold as "redemptioners." The marriage records of the sparsely settled town of Boston at that time contain many such facts as the following: Under the date 1656 appears an entry that "Edmond Cousins, of Pulling point, and Margaret Bird, an Irish maid-servant to John Grover, were married." Under date 1659, "John Morrell, an Irishman, and Lysbell Morrell, an Irishwoman, were married on the 31st of August by John Endecott, Gov." Under 1666, "John Reylean, an Irishman, and Margaret Brene, an Irishwoman, were married on the 15th of March by John Endecott, Gov." And "Bryan Morfrey, an Irishman, and Margaret Mayhoone, widow, were married on the 20th of July by John Endecott, Gov." There

are a number of such entries. The Brigantine Ann and Rebecca, Captain Thomas Hendry, brought passengers from Dublin, Ireland, at the same period, who agreed to serve four years for the cost of their transportation and for certain clothing. Some of these passengers were obliged to petition the Government in Boston to compel Captain Hendry to complete his contract, as is shown by their petition preserved in the Massachusetts archives.

The Catholic Irish who reached Massachusetts at that time, and that means practically the great majority of the native-born Irish, were regarded by the Puritans with contempt and aversion. They escaped from under the Cromwellian harrow to come under the Massachusetts Bay roller. As may be readily realized, they were destitute, wretched and, save probably in very few cases, unable to speak any language save their native speech, the Gaelic. The cultivated segment of their nationality, the natural chiefs and leaders of their people, had been plundered, killed or driven to Connaught. Forty thousand Irish soldiers, including most of the old nobility and principal persons in Ireland, found a refuge in staying alone before the close of the Cromwellian era. Those of the wretched residue who managed to reach Massachusetts found a religious penal code in existence there just as antagonistic to Catholicism as the rule of Cromwell.

Catholics were not tolerated within the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Bay colony, and, of course, Catholic priests were strictly prohibited from entering within the domain of the Puritan theocracy. Here is the Puritan statute enacted in 1647 in reference to Catholic priests. The law is quoted verbatim, and the spelling of the words is given precisely as in the original.

“JESUITES.

“This court taking into consideration the Great Wars, Combustions and Divisions which are this day in Europe, and that the same are observed to be raised and formented, chiefly by the secret underminings, and solicitations of those of the Jesuitical Order; Men brought up and Devoted to the Religion and Court of Room, which hath occasioned divers states to expel them their Territories, for prevention whereof among our selves;

“It is Ordered and Enacted by Authority of this Court, that no Jesuite or Spiritual or Ecclesiastical person (as they are termed), Ordained by the Authority of the Pope or See of Room, shall henceforth at any time repair to, or come within this Jurisdiction; And if any person shall give just cause of suspicion, that he is one of such Society or Order, he shall be brought before some of the Magistrates, and if he cannot free himself of such suspicion, he

shall be committed to Prison, or bound over to the next Court of Assistants, to be tryed and proceeded with, by banishment or otherwise as the Court shall see cause.

"And if any person so Banished, be taken the second time within the Jurisdiction, upon lawful tryal and conviction, he shall be put to death. Provided this law shall not extend to any such Jesuite, Spiritual or Ecclesiastical person, as shall be cast upon our Shores by Ship-wreck or other accident, so as he continue no longer than till he may have opportunity of Passage for his departure; nor to any such as shall come in company with any Messenger hither upon publick occasions, or Merchant, or Master of any Ship belonging to any place, not in enmity with the State of England or our selves, so as they depart again with the same Messenger, Master or Merchant, and behave themselves inoffensively during their abode here."

So radically opposed to anything savoring of the Pope or "See of Room" were the Massachusetts Puritans that they abolished the observance of Christmas Day as a holiday by the following law in 1670:

"For preventing disorders arising in several places within this jurisdiction by reason of some still observing such festivals, as were superstitiously kept in other Countries, to the great dishonour of God and offense of others ;

"It is therefore Ordered by this Court and the Authority thereof, that whosoever shall be found observing any such day as Christmas or the like, either by forbearing labour, feasting, or any other way upon any such account as aforesaid, every such person so offending, shall pay for every such offense five shillings as a fine to the County."

Another law, passed as early as 1641, prohibited the franchise to any one save members of the Church in good standing.

Such were a few of the laws confronting the wretched Irish Catholics who reached the Massachusetts shores in those days. It is not surprising, therefore, to find in the early town records of Boston announcements of the marriage ceremony as having been performed by the Governor or other competent official where one or both the contracting parties were of Irish birth and probably baptized Catholics, such as Collins, Healy, Kelly, Kenny, Larkin, McCarty, McLaughlin, Murphy, O'Connell, etc. It may be noticed also as bearing on the closeness of intercourse between the Massachusetts Bay and Ireland that at the close of the fierce war with the Indians led by King Philip, the colonists being reduced to a state of extreme destitution, were relieved by a liberal donation from Ireland in 1677. This donation was in the form of a cargo of

provisions and clothing, despatched from Dublin by friends of the Boston Churches per the ship Katherine of Dublin, consigned to a Boston committee of three, Messrs. William Ting, James Olliver and John Hull, who were authorized by the consignors to sell a sufficient portion of the cargo to defray the expenses of the voyage and then distribute the balance among the most destitute. Persons in Boston, as well as in the surrounding towns, received their pro rata share of this donation. A detailed account of the distribution in the various towns is given and preserved in a record of the State archives. From this may be seen the peculiar but somewhat close connection between Irish ports and those of Massachusetts at that early time. Not only "redemptioners" arrived, but doubtless many who paid their transportation, and probably others who worked their passage.

It may be that the majority of the Irish who landed in Massachusetts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were baptized as Catholics. There is no means of definitely determining the probable number. But this we know, that the original Catholic emigrants were obliged to conform outwardly at least to the Church established by law, and we know further that their descendants, with few exceptions, became to all intents and purposes, Puritans. It was not before the close of the Revolutionary War that any substantial relaxation of the laws against Catholicism was made.

Many years ago the present writer ran across quite a settlement of Yankee farmers named Murphy a short distance from the seashore in the State of Maine. They were typical Yankees, tall, sinewy and angular. They attended the Methodist, Baptist or other Protestant form of worship, and I found a few of them very suspicious that the Pope had some ulterior designs on the American Republic, but each admitted that they were originally of Irish extraction and that the first of the name who settled in that neighborhood was probably a Catholic.

A similar settlement of Larkins outside the city of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, traced their descent back to an Irish Larkin who settled there in the early part of the eighteenth century, during the time when the first great exodus of the Irish to America began. Irish Protestant woolen manufacturers, as well as their Protestant and Catholic employees, were involved in the general ruin superinduced by the legal wiping out of the native woolen trade in the reign of William III. and Queen Ann. Then it was that the ships sailing from Cork, Youghal, Dungarvan, Waterford, Dublin, Newry, Belfast and Derry brought their freight of human beings to the American colonies. Massachusetts received quite a portion of this exodus, including Catholics, notwithstanding the radical

prohibition of Catholicism. Maltreated people, such as the Catholics of Ireland were in those days, do not investigate very closely the probable environment which the future may have in store; they only wish to escape from the pressing hardship of present conditions. Then it was that Derry, Peterborough and other practically exclusive Irish settlements were made in New Hampshire. Then it was that the fleeing Irish drifted into the sparsely settled territory of Massachusetts. They had strong hands, inured to toil, and willing hearts to win them a sustenance.

Into the two ports of Boston Harbor, Charlestown and Boston, the records show that a little over one thousand emigrants from Ireland came between 1737 and 1740. In 1737 the Charitable Irish Society of Boston was founded. It is the oldest Irish organization in North America. According to its original constitution, Irish Protestants only, or those of Irish extraction, were eligible as officers, **but the election of these officers** and the annual celebration of the society were fixed to take place annually on St. Patrick's Day. This organization in the time of the Revolution furnished several officers to Washington's army, including General Knox. A very few of them preferred to take the English side, and they removed from Boston when General Howe evacuated the city on March 17, 1776. But it is quite clear that not a man of them professed to be or had ever heard of the mythical tribe designated by some writers of the nineteenth century as Scotch Irish.

Take the case of Maurice O'Brien, the father of Captain Jeremiah O'Brien, of the naval service, already referred to. All that the most careful biographer of the O'Briens, the Rev. Andrew M. Sherman, can learn about the old gentleman, who lived until 1799, is that he was born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1715; that he was a tailor by trade; that about the year 1738 he emigrated to America; that he settled first in Kittery, opposite Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and that about 1739 or 1740 he married Mary Cain, who, the biographer naively informs us, "was of the Protestant faith." They reared a family of six sons and three daughters. In another place Rev. Mr. Sherman says: "In religious belief Maurice O'Brien was a Baptist," but, there being no church of the Baptist persuasion in Machais, he attended the Congregationalist church in the village. He further says that Maurice had an old portrait of King Brian Borohime, which he brought with him from Ireland and prized highly to the end of his days, and that he used to tell his neighbors thrilling tales of his grandfather's exploits (more probably his father's) under the leadership of Patrick Sarsfield at the Boyne and other engagements during the war between James II. and William III. at the close of the seventeenth century.

The probabilities, by enormous odds, are that Maurice O'Brien and his wife, Mary Cain, were Catholics. But as Catholics they were not tolerated within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, and they conformed to the local religious forms, and naturally their children followed them. The law in Massachusetts, as well as in Ireland at that time, did not recognize the existence of a Catholic, save as an enemy. A powerful light is thrown upon the situation of Catholics in Massachusetts at that time by the following: Maurice O'Brien, his eldest son, Jeremiah, and the next oldest son, Gideon, with seventy-seven other males, petitioned the General Court of Massachusetts to grant them a territory for a township on the southerly side of the Machias River. The grant was finally made by the Legislature on the 26th of April, 1770, by which each of the petitioners became owners in fee simple of two hundred and fifty acres of land on the river front toward the sea, upon the following conditions: "That the petitioners should within six years after they should have obtained his Majesty's approbation of the grant, unless prevented from so doing by war, settle the township with eighty good Protestant families, build eighty houses . . . that they build a suitable meeting-house for the public worship of God, and settle a learned Protestant minister and make provision for his comfortable and honorable support."

The suitable meeting-house was built and the Protestant minister was secured in 1772. That seems to throw considerable light upon Tailor Maurice O'Brien, who is declared to be a Baptist while attending the Congregationalist Church services, which was really the State religion. Schoolmaster John Sullivan, of Berwick, and his distinguished family and many other families stand in like case. But it can be truthfully said of these transmogrified Catholics that they were among the foremost and boldest in challenging King George's power from the very dawn of the Revolution.

The spirit of intolerance to Catholics was such that on the very eve of the Revolution itself the authorities of the town of Boston officially voted that "in regard to religion, mutual toleration in the different professions thereof is what all good and candid minds in all ages have ever practiced," but they excepted "the Roman Catholics or Papists," because their belief was "subversive of society."

These authoritative muster rolls of "Massachusetts Soldiers and Sailors in the Revolutionary War" tell a curious and surprising story. It destroys in large measure the old legend so carefully propagated that the population of Massachusetts up to the middle of the nineteenth century was almost of unmixed English blood. And it makes a scathing criticism of Senator Lodge's statement

that "there was only a slight sprinkling, chiefly in New Hampshire, of Scotch Irish from Londonderry." This cyclopean compilation, now practically completed, will do something to correct erroneous impressions and to cause a revision of the ancient legend.

P. O'NEILL LARKIN.

Boston, Mass.

A PREFECT OF THE AMBROSIANA.

"In memoria de Monsignore Antonio Maria Ceriani, Prefetto della Biblioteca Ambrosiana." Con illustrazioni. Milan, 1908.

"Le Cardinal Frédéric Borromée." Par Charles Quesnel, Lille, 1890.

ON THE afternoon of the feast of the Blessed Virgin's Conception, in the year 1609, a memorable gathering was held in the Church of S. Sepolcro at Milan. Thither had come, at the bidding of Cardinal Federico Borromeo, then Archbishop of Milan, the chancellor, Senators, magistrates and officials of the city, together with the canons of the Duomo and representatives of various religious orders. In the words of Manzoni, which Milan has engraved on the pedestal of the statue erected in 1865 in memory of the Cardinal, "Federico Borromeo was one of those men, rare in all ages, who have used their splendid talents, the resources of their great fortunes and the privileges of their high rank in constantly seeking after and doing good." Nephew of the great St. Charles, the Cardinal's fame, it has been remarked, was overshadowed by that of his uncle. But as long as the Ambrosian Library at Milan stands or is remembered his name will live in the annals of literature as its founder. From the days of Virgil and Ovid to those of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, so its annals tell us, Milan had been a literary centre. Under the Sforsas Milan attained such a reputation in art and letters that it was called the New Athens. In the days of St. Charles this reputation had been lost. He did much to combat the ignorance into which clergy and people had sunk. He founded his splendid seminaries for the former and the great College of Brera for the latter, but his short life, although miraculous as it seems to us in what he was able to do, could not suffice for all, and so many things had to be left to his successors. Chief among these was the revival in art and letters. In reforming the clergy and by gathering around himself learned men from all parts he made this work possible. Cardinal Federico Borromeo determined to carry it out, to revive in Milan its ancient love for the fine arts and learning, which too many then, as in our times, despised as useless to enable them to push their way in the world.

The gathering in the Church of S. Sepolcro was called to celebrate the opening of the library and college of the Ambrosiana, greatest of the institutions the Cardinal founded to promote culture. After some sacred music had been heard, and the Cardinal had listened to a Latin speech from one of his canons, he received nine Oblates of St. Ambrose as "Doctors of the Ambrosiana." To each he gave a gold medal, having on its obverse a Madonna, with the words "Monstra Te esse Matrem," while on its reverse were the heads of St. Charles and St. Ambrose, with the motto of the doctors, "Singuli singula." Among the doctors received were Olgiati, first prefect, or keeper of the Ambrosian Library, and Salmazzio, both of whom had been keen and diligent searchers after literary treasures to fill the shelves of the new library.

Olgiati had ransacked Central Europe, buying books and manuscripts with funds liberally supplied by Cardinal Borromeo. But many he was given by the learned lovers of learning in Germany, the Netherlands and France, donors eager to help the good work of the Milanese Cardinal. Indeed, Olgiati was at times overwhelmed with gifts, as, for instance, at Antwerp, where the Jesuit, Andrew Scott, "usque ad invidiam ditavit." Salmazzio made his way to the east, and, in spite of corsairs at sea and brigands on land, and the jealousy of the Greeks, he was able to procure many valuable manuscripts, and was preparing to visit Crete and Mount Athos when he was recalled to Milan. To him belongs the glory of having been the forerunner of Curzon and many others who in the last century went to Greece, Syria, Egypt and Sinai on a like quest. Among the remaining doctors received were Ripamonti, historian of the Diocese of Milan; Gigao, familiar with Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldaic and Arabic, and Prusca, the commentator of our English Ockham.

As soon as the doctors of the Ambrosiana had been received, they conducted the Cardinal and his guests to the library, built beside the Church of S. Sepolcro, because that was the quietest spot in Milan—a quietude which the library still enjoys amid the noisy bustle of the modern city. All were amazed at the beauty of the library and college, which Mangone had designed and Bussola had arranged and ornamented. The buildings had taken six years to erect. But all wondered more when the Cardinal showed them the rich literary treasures he had already amassed, not indeed for his own personal gratification, not to be hoarded away in cupboards, as was then the case in many Italian libraries, but to be enjoyed freely by all comers from all lands and for all time. The opening of the Ambrosiana was hailed with delight by Justus Lipsius and all the learned men of that time. As Mabillon remarked, had the Cardinal

in founding the library sought glory for his family, his desire would have been fully satisfied. But the motto of his family, "Humilitas," had turned his thoughts to higher things, more worthy of the Borromeos, who inscribed that device on all their palaces. In the lifetime of the Cardinal the Ambrosiana counted its thirty-five thousand volumes and its fifteen thousand manuscripts. These might be consulted or studied during the working hours of every day by students, at whose disposal chairs, desks, paper, pens and ink were placed. In those days men marveled at facilities and such helps to enable thirsty students to slack their thirst for knowledge. Libraries then were rather the burial than the birthplaces of literature.¹

The Ambrosian Library has attached to it the names of several great scholars, men whom the stores of manuscripts and books and the trained staff of "Doctors of the Ambrosiana" enabled to render deathless service to science and learning. Among these, two stand out nobly. One was Muratorî, whom Leo XIII., in his "Letter on Historical Studies," names as having collected an unsurpassed mass of material for Italian history. He was during six years the keeper of the Ambrosian Library, before he was called back in 1700 to Modena by its duke, whose subject he was. The other is also named in Pope Leo's letter as "the honor and glory of the Sacred College." This was Cardinal Angelo Mai, "the discoverer of more lost works and the transcriber of more ancient manuscripts, sacred and profane, than it has fallen to any one else's share in modern times to publish."² While still a student at Orvieto an edict of the first Napoleon forced him to return to his native province, and he took up his residence in Milan, where he was received Doctor of the Ambrosiana. Cardinal Wiseman is mistaken, however, when he attributes to Mai the "wonderful discovery consisting in the reading of manuscripts twice written, or, as they are more scientifically called, palimpsests, from the vellum having been scraped again to prepare it for a second writing."³ The earliest deciphered palimpsest appears to have been the well-known "Codex Ephremi."⁴ But the process was brought to perfection by Mai, who with incredible patience and labor "poured out an unintermitting stream of volumes containing works or portions of works lost, as it was supposed, irrecoverably."⁵ His reputation became world-wide.

¹ Our account of the founding of the Ambrosiana is taken from Quesnel's interesting biography of Cardinal Federico Borromeo, Chapter V., *passim*.

² Wiseman, "The Four Last Popes," p. 481.

³ *Ibid*, p. 484.

⁴ See *Dublin Review* for November, 1841, p. 409, in an article on Cardinal Mai, by Dr. C. Russell.

⁵ Wiseman, *Op. cit.*, p. 486.

From prefect of the Ambrosiana he was, at the instance of Cardinal Consalvi, transferred to Rome to be keeper of the Vatican Library, to continue there the wonderful discoveries and a labor of love that only ended at his death, on September 8, 1854, at Albano, at the age of eighty years.

Between Cardinal Mai and Antonio Ceriani, one of his successors as prefect of the Ambrosian Library, whose death a little more than a year ago was mourned wherever learning is honored, there is much in common. Both sprung from that sturdy race of peasants scattered over the upper half of Italy who have given to the See of Peter a Sixtus the Fifth and a Pius the Tenth. Cardinal Mai dearly loved the little mountain village where he was born, and, adds Cardinal Wiseman, he enriched "the community of the poor" of his birthplace by making them his heirs. Ceriani was born on May 2, 1828, in the obscure little village of Uboldo, near Saronno, in one of those humble Lombardian homesteads, built of roughly-hewn stones, with heavily tiled roofs, in which the living-rooms of the family and the shelters for domestic animals are so mingled that on seeing them our thoughts instantly travel to that inn at Bethlehem. But the love of home, "be it ever so humble," is intense among Italian peasants, and although poverty forces many of them to seek fortune abroad, their hearts remain true to their old homes. It is no rare thing in the villages on the slopes of the Alps or of the Apennines to meet men of middle age, speaking English with an American accent, who have come back with their hard-earned gains across the Atlantic to spend the evening of life in the poor village where they were born, and then, "life's toils o'er," to be laid to rest under the shadow of the rustic church in which they were baptized. Of peasant parentage, "figlio di poveri contadini," Ceriani's native village of Uboldo was dear to his heart. There, by some freak of Italian law, though living all his long life in Milan, he was able to keep his legal domicile. Thither he would return to give his vote as a parliamentary elector, or to take part in the deliberations of its communal council, of which he was a member. These visits to Uboldo formed the sole change he allowed himself from his labors in connection with the Ambrosian Library. When hot winds swept the plains of Lombardy, and Milan sweltered beneath the broiling summer sun, and others fled to the bracing breezes of the mountains or to the cool evenings by the sea, he stayed at his post, deeming, as the great Muratori did, that "not rest, but change of toil gives rest."

His early education was received in a college at Monza. From there he proceeded to study for the Church in the seminaries of Milan. In 1852 he was ordained priest. Having obtained at the

University of Pavia the diploma of professor of humanities, he taught these during three years, when he was appointed keeper of the catalogue of the Ambrosian Library. From that moment, as one who knew him well has said, "the library became his home—his kingdom. In its vast halls, lit by lofty windows and encumbered with books, where were gathered the thoughts of so many dead generations, he lived and conversed with the great men of twenty and more centuries. He made them live again in his own mind, and by his writings in the minds of his contemporaries and of future generations."⁶ And adds the same authority: "His way of life is soon told. It was a life of study and prayer." His early mornings were spent in prayer and meditation. Out of respect he always read the Divine Office with his head bared. His devotion in saying Holy Mass kept him over three-quarters of an hour at the altar. At 10 o'clock, the hour when the library opened, he was at his post, remaining at it until the hour for closing struck. At mid-day he allowed himself a few minutes to take standing in some quiet nook of the library a frugal lunch of bread and a couple of eggs. In the evening he broke off work to take a simple dinner, after which he gave to his friends a couple of hours' delightful conversation. Then he resumed his studies, continuing them until midnight and even later. Thus in his daily labors Ceriani only allowed himself two brief breaks.

Other breaks there were now and again that must have been irksome indeed. These were caused when strangers came, with little or no claim on his attention, as did the present writer, to be shown some of the literary treasures under Monsignore Ceriani's charge. Our visit to the library was in 1899, when he had been nearly thirty years—since January, 1870—the prefect, or head librarian, of the Ambrosiana. It is a thing of joy to remember the somewhat bent figure, bent from habitual labor, not with age, of the learned librarian, his hair white from study, his broad forehead, his rugged, powerful features, and his eyes so shrewd yet so kind. They expressed a twofold love, love of the treasures under his charge and love of his neighbors, passing strangers though they were. In this, again, Ceriani and Mai were alike, for, as Cardinal Wiseman has recorded, "seldom was it my lot to lead any party to visit the Vatican Library while Monsignor Mai was its librarian without his leaving his own pursuits to show us its treasures, and not the least valuable of them himself."⁷ But the courtesy shown

⁶ See speech by D. Carlo Pellegrini in the "In Memoria" mentioned at the head of this article, p. 74. It is from this book we have taken most of our details about Monsignore Ceriani.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 489.

us by Ceriani appears to be traditional with the prefects of the Ambrosian Library. The late Bishop Amherst tells us how he was shown round the Ambrosian Library as we were. He was then a youth of twenty-three. The party with whom he was traveling was in charge of a Bishop. "As we walked round a case of open books and manuscripts in different Oriental languages," writes Dr. Amherst, "the Bishop explained the various languages, and what the books and manuscripts were about, to the evident admiration of the librarian, who presently came up to me and asked if that was Monsignor Wiseman." The Bishop was none other. Dr. Wiseman's reputation as an Orientalist had made the librarian suspect that his learned visitor could be none other than the future Cardinal. This was in 1842, but had the Cardinal lived to revisit the Ambrosian Library some thirty years later, he would have found in Ceriani his peer in Oriental learning.⁸

Padre Ceriani had taught himself perfectly both Hebrew and Syriac. He was also familiar with Sanscrit, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian and other Oriental languages. He spoke English and French perfectly, and he could read German. But his fame rests on his mastery of Syriac, Greek and Latin palaeography. In this he was without his equal in Europe. Of the works he wrote or edited, and of the papers he contributed to reviews or to the transactions of learned societies, among which must be noted the Palaeographical and Henry Bradshaw Societies, of London, a bibliography will be found in the "In Memoria" already quoted.

Much of the work Ceriani undertook he was able to complete with success. But his critical edition of the "Peshito," which it was the desire of his heart to carry through to the end, was left unfinished at his death. He sacrificed its completion by himself when he made an act of almost heroic obedience to his Archbishop. The latter, in 1872, requested him to undertake the revision of the Ambrosian Missal. He accepted, though he knew that this undertaking would prevent his carrying on his other cherished work. His keen eyes quickly detected that changes had been made in the Missal, in the editions printed in 1594 and in 1751. The Archbishop of Milan and the Holy See agreed in desiring that the new edition should be purged of all the modifications that had been introduced into the Missal without reasonable motives. Four years later, after collating all the editions of the Missal he could find, after a comparative study of the earliest codices of the Ambrosian liturgy with the earliest liturgies of the East and West, Ceriani produced the new edition of the Ambrosian Missal. In presenting it, on behalf of the Archbishop of Milan, to the Sovereign Pontiff

⁸ Roskell's "Memoirs of Dr. Amherst," p. 141.

he was able to say that he had not changed an iota of the text through caprice; that he had taken away modern additions, and had substituted the older versions that through ages had been used in the Ambrosian liturgy. D. Carlo Pellegrini expresses the hope that a complete edition of Ceriani's liturgical studies may be published. Their value may be gauged by his "*Notitia Liturgiae Ambrosianae*," in which he shows that the Ambrosian is none other than the ancient Roman Liturgy.

The works of Padre Ceriani were appreciated highly by the learned of all nations, but perhaps more among the English-speaking peoples than even by his own nation. The present Anglican Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Wordsworth, in his learned work on the Vulgate, calls him "*doctissimus et dulcissimus Ceriani*." Sir E. Maunde Thompson, the librarian of the British Museum, in offering his condolence to the Ambrosiana on Ceriani's death, speaks of him as "a great scholar whose memory will be cherished by many English friends." Long before his death his works had attracted the notice of various learned societies. In the 60's of the last century he had been elected member of the Royal Societies of Science and Letters of Lombardy, of Naples and of Berlin. In 1898 he was chosen honorary member of the Royal Irish Academy, and in the same year the Boston Society of Literature and Biblical Exegesis enrolled him among its members. The Italian Government honored itself by making him a member of the ancient order of knighthood of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, and by approving of the appointment as his successor at the Ambrosian Library of Monsignore Achille Ratti, whom Ceriani was wont to call "the son of his heart."

Above all, Ceriani was a priest, deeply impressed with the nobility of his priesthood. Immediately after his ordination he joined the Congregation of the Oblates of St. Ambrose and St. Charles, and, although he lived apart from the community, in a modest house with his sister—"La Sorella," as he affectionately called her—to keep house for him, he always observed, as far as circumstances allowed, the rule of the Oblate Fathers. In obedience to it he went twice a week to confession, and made his yearly retreat at the house of the Oblates at Rhè. During the half century and more of his connection with the Ambrosian Library these yearly retreats, his flying visits to his native village and four literary voyages were the sole occasions of his absenting himself from his post of duty. In 1861 he visited England. In the following year he went to Naples. He returned in 1866 to England to continue his researches at the British Museum and in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge. On both his English visits he was the honored

guest of his brethren, the Oblates of St. Charles, in the house founded at Bayswater by Cardinal Manning. As a token of his affection for his English brethren, he sent copies of his works to enrich their library at St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater. And if any of the Oblate Fathers from London came to Milan, Padre Ceriani was ever ready to offer them hospitality. Indeed, his affection for all who spoke "our own dear tongue" was so great that it is said that even in his official reports he was unable to conceal it. His last literary voyage was to Rome in 1888. Nine years later he was created a Protonotary Apostolic, and in 1903 he was appointed a consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. Amid all his vast researches and studies he found time to lecture on palaeography at the Royal Academy of Milan, and to take an active share in the work of the official archæological commission of Lombardy. Yet, notwithstanding all the honors forced on him and all the various and ample labors with which he was burdened, Ceriani remained ever the same humble priest to the last, delighting in giving lessons in catechism to little children in the Church of S. Sepolcro, even to the closing year of his life.

If Ceriani had a great mind, he had a still greater heart. His love for his birthplace has been recorded; his love for his parents was shown by the way he kept, as a precious relic, a bit of cloth his dear mother had woven. And in the production of his learned works how heartily he thanked all who had helped him in any wise! Not merely his copyists—students of the seminary—and his printer received his thanks, but even the foreman of the printer's compositors comes in each for his meed of thanks. And when his printer died, leaving his family in need, Ceriani, out of his slender purse, provided for the education of the printer's children. No wonder, then, that Ceriani, as he had lived, so he died, a poor priest. The only riches he had laid up in his humble home were his books. These he left to the Ambrosian Library, and the authorities of the Ambrosiana have decided wisely to keep Ceriani's collection of books together, not to scatter its volumes over the shelves of the vast library.

Monsignore Ceriani's long life only fell short of the fourscore years allotted to Cardinal Mai by fourteen months. What changes his beloved Lombardy had seen during that long lapse of time! He was already a youth of twenty when Radetzky and his white-coated Austrians victoriously reëntered Milan in 1848; he had been two years a doctor of the Ambrosiana when the cannon of Solferino sounded the knell of Austrian tyranny over Lombardy. We may believe that Ceriani felt patriotic and legitimate joy when the hated strangers were turned away from Milan's gates, when he saw the

double-headed eagle of Austria replaced by the cross of Savoy. But the complete story of his life has yet to be told. Meanwhile Milan has shown its sorrow at his passing away. The end came swiftly on March 2, 1907, not without all the consolations the Church provides for the dying. "That he was good, that his life was saintly we can easily understand when we know how high a standard he always put before him of the Catholic faith, in which he lived and in which he died." So spoke the Italian official delegate in his oration over the body of the deceased prelate. A similar note is struck by the delegate of the Royal Institute of Lombardy when he speaks of Ceriani's "simple and holy life." These official utterances by sons of the kingdom of Italy strongly contrast with what the republican officials of France would utter under similar circumstances!

At the funeral in the ancient Church of St. Ambrose, in Milan, were present the Auxiliary Bishop of Cardinal Ferrari, representing His Eminence, detained in Rome; a representative of the Italian Minister of Public Instruction, the Syndic, or Mayor, of Milan, its Senator, the canons of the Duomo and of St. Ambrose, the doctors of the Ambrosiana, the civil and military authorities of the city, delegates of many learned societies and laity, rich and poor.

On the following day they laid him to rest in the church of that little village of Uboldo that he had made famous. His own fame cannot die so long as the learned possess his magnificent "*Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*," of which he published the first volume when he was barely thirty-three years of age. This great work is Ceriani's best monument, though his grateful fellow-citizens did well to erect in the courtyard of the Ambrosian Library a marble memorial of the great scholar. But it is not the recollection of his vast learning that recalls to mind Longfellow's lines:

The lives of great men all remind us
That we may make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

The learning of Ceriani has left footprints behind that time will not quickly obliterate. But if we would know what made his life sublime, we find it in his humility. Humility was the keynote of his life. The motto of the Borromeos, "*Humilitas*," the sons of St. Charles have ever taken as their own. Few ever practiced this virtue so perfectly as the subject of this short sketch. When he kept the golden jubilee of his priesthood, Leo XIII. had honored him with a gold medal. Later, in 1905, when he celebrated the half century during which he had been attached to the Ambrosian

Library, Pius X. sent his own portrait to him, and in his own handwriting congratulated him on his long connection with the Ambrosiana "cum summo Ecclesiae decore studiorumque sacrorum profectu." And the same year, when Ceriani offered to the Holy Father a splendid phototype of a manuscript of the Ambrosian Library, Pius X. thanked him in an autograph letter. This letter Ceriani never showed even to his nearest friends, but it was found among his private papers after his death. His humility had hidden it. He tried, says his panegyrist, to ward off all honors, and would say with a smile: "Honors will not make an old man young. All I desire is to be left in peace." But if he avoided honors, if in his humiliation he refused to display them even when accorded by the Sovereign Pontiff, he valued highly the blessings the Popes bestowed on his works. And, as a humble child, he delighted to be allowed to lay the first fruits of his rich harvests at the feet of the Holy Father.

WILFRID C. ROBINSON.

Bruges, Belgium.

CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICA DE ROMANA CURIA

PIVS EPISCOPVS

SERVVS SERVORVM DEI

Ad Perpetvam Rei Memoriam.

SAPIENTI consilio sa. me. Pontifex Xystus V, Decessorum vestigiis inhaerens eorumque coepta perficiens, sacros Cardinalium coetus, seu Romanas Congregationes, quarum aliquot iam erant ad certa negotia institutae, augeri numero voluit, ac suls quamque finibus contineri. Quare Apostolicis Litteris, die XXII mensis Ianuarii an. MDLXXXVII, queis initium, *Immensa*, eiusmodi Congregationes constituit quindecim, ut, "partita inter eos aliosque romanae Curiae magistratus ingenti curarum negotiorumque mole," quae solet ad Sanctam Sedem deferri, iam necesse non esset tan multa in Consistorio agi ac deliberari, simulque possent controversiae diligentius expendi, et celerius faciliusque eorum expediri negotia, qui undique, sive studio religionis ac pietatis, sive iuris persequendi, sive gratiae impetrandae, aliisve de causis ad Summum Pontificem confugerent.

Quantum vero utilitatis ex sacris his Congregationibus accesserit sive ad ecclesiasticam disciplinam tuendam, sive ad iustitiam administrandam, sive ad ipsos Romanos Pontifices relevandos, crescentibus in dies curis negotiisque distentos, compertum ex Ecclesiae historia exploratumque omnibus est.

Verum decursu temporis ordinatio Romanae Curiae a Xysto V. potissimum per memoratas Apostolicas Litteras constituta, haud integra perstitit. Nam et Sacrarum Congregationum numerus, pro rerum ac temporum necessitatibus, modo auctus est, modo deminutus; atque ipsa iurisdictio unicuique Congregationi primitus attributa, modo novis Romanorum Pontificum praescriptis, modo usu aliquo sensim inducto ratoque habito, mutationibus obnoxia fuit. Quo factum est ut hodie singularum iurisdictio, seu *competentia*, non omnibus perspicua nec bene divisa evaserit; plures ex Sacris Congregationibus eadem de re ius dicere valeant, et nonnullae ad pauca tantum negotia expedienda redactae sint, dum aliae negotiis obruuntur.

Quapropter haud pauci Episcopi ac sapientes viri, maxime vero S. R. E. Cardinales, tum scriptis tum voce, et apud Decessorem Nostrum fel. rec. Leonem XIII., et apud Nos ipsos saepe institerunt ut opportuna remedia hisce incommodis afferrentur. Quod Nos quidem pro parte praestare curavimus datis Litteris die VII mensis

Decembris anno MCMIII, *Romanis Pontificibus*; aliisque datis die XXVIII mensis Ianuarii anno MCMIV, *Quae in Ecclesiae bonum*; itemque aliis datis die XXVI mensis Maii anno MCMVI, *Sacrae Congregationi super negotiis*.

Cum vero in praesenti res quoque sit de ecclesiasticis legibus in unum colligendis, maxime opportunum visum est a Romana Curia ducere initium, ut ipsa, modo apto et omnibus perspicuo ordinata, Romano Pontifici Ecclesiaeque operam suam praestare facilius valeat et suppetias ferre perfectius.

Quamobrem, adhibitis in consilium pluribus S. R. E. Cardinalibus, statuimus ac decernimus, ut Congregationes, Tribunalia et Officia, quae Romanam Curiam componunt et quibus Ecclesiae universae negotia pertractanda reservantur, post ferias autumnales decurrentis anni, hoc est a die III mensis Novembris MDCCCXVIII, non alia sint, praeter consueta sacra Consistoria, quam quae praesenti Constitutione decernuntur, eaque numero, ordine, competentia, divisa et constituta maneant his legibus, quae sequuntur.

I.

SACRAE CONGREGATIONES.

I. CONGREGATIO SANCTI OFFICII.

1. Haec Sacra Congregatio, cui Summus Pontifex praeest, doctrinam fidei et morum tutatur.

2. Eidem proinde soli manet iudicium de haeresi aliisque criminibus, quae suspicionem haeresis inducunt.

3. Ad ipsam quoque devoluta est universa res de Indulgentiis, sive quae doctrinam spectet, sive quae usum respiciat.

4. Quidquid ad Ecclesiae praecepta refertur, uti abstinentiae, ieiunia, festa servanda, id omne, huic Sacro Consilio sublatum, Congregationi Concilii tribuitur; quidquid ad Episcoporum electionem spectat, sibi vindicat Congregatio Consistorialis; relaxationem vero votorum in religione seu in religiosis institutis emissorum, Congregatio negotiis sodalium religiosorum praeposita.

5. Etsi peculiaris Congregatio sit constituta *de disciplina Sacramentorum*, nihilominus intergra manet Sancti Officii facultas ea cognoscendi quae circa privilegium, uti, aiunt, Paulinum, et impedimenta disparitatis cultus et mixtae religionis versantur, praeter ea quae attingunt dogmaticam de matrimonio, sicut etiam de aliis Sacramentis, doctrinam.

2. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

1. Duas haec Sacra Congregatio, easque distinctas partes complectitur;

2. Ad primam spectat non modo parare agenda in Consistoriis, sed praeterea in locis Congregationi de Propaganda Fide non obnoxiiis novas dioeceses iam constitutas dividere; Episcopos, Administratores apostolicos, Adiutores et Auxiliarios Episcoporum eligere; canonicas inquisitiones seu *processus* super eligendis indicere actosque diligenter expendere; ipsorum periclitari doctrinam. At si viri eligendi vel dioeceses constituendae aut dividendae sint extra Italiam, administri Officii a publicis negotiis, vulgo *Secretariae Status*, ipsi documenta excipient et *Positionem* conficient, Congregationi Consistoriali subiiciendam.

3. Altera pars ea omnia comprehendit, quae ad singularum diocesum regimen, modo Congregationi de Propaganda Fide subiectae non sint, universim referuntur, quaeque ad Congregationes Episcoporum et Concilii hactenus pertinebant, et modo Consistoriali tribuuntur. Ad hanc proinde in posterum spectent vigilantia super inpletis vel minus obligationibus, quibus Ordinarii tenentur; cognitio eorum quae ab Episcopis scripto relata sint de statu suarum dioecesium; indictio apostolicarum visitationum, examenque earum quae fuerint absolutae, et, post fidelem rerum expositionem ad Nos delatam singulis vicibus, praescriptio eorum, quae aut necessaria visa fuerint aut opportuna; denique ea omnia quae ad regimen, disciplinam, temporalem administrationem et studia Seminariorum pertinent.

4. Huius Congregationis erit, in conflictatione iurium, dubia solvere circa *competentiam* Sacrarum Congregationum.

5. Huius Sacri Consilii Summus Pontifex perget esse Praefectus. Eique Cardinales a *secretis* S. Officii et *Secretarius Status* semper ex officio accensentur, praeter alios, quos Summus Pontifex eidem adscribendos censuerit.

6. A secretis semper esto Cardinalis a Summo Pontifice ad id munus eligendus; alter ab ipso erit Praelatus cui *Adessoris* nomen, qui idem fungetur munere a secretis Sacri Collegii Patrum Cardinalium, et sub ipso sufficiens administratorum numerus.

7. Consultores huius Congregationis erunt *Adessor* Sancti Officii, et a *secretis* Congregationis pro negotiis ecclesiasticis extraordinariis, durante munere: quibus accedent alii, quos Summus Pontifex elegerit.

3. CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM.

1. Est huic Sacrae Congregationi proposita universa legislatio circa disciplinam septem Sacramentorum, incolumi iure Congregationis Sancti Officii, secundum ea quae superius statuta sunt, et Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis circa caeremonias quae in Sacramentis conficiendis, ministrandis et recipiendis servari debent.

2. Itaque eidem Congregationi tribuuntur ea omnia, quae huc

usque ab aliis Congregationibus, Tribunalibus aut Officiis Romanae Curiae decerni concedique consueverant tum in disciplina matrimonii, uti dispensationes in foro externo tam pauperibus quam divitibus, sanationes in radice, dispensatio super rato, separatio coniugum, natalium restitutio seu legitimatio prolis; tum in disciplina aliorum Sacramentorum, uti dispensationes ordinandis concedendae, salvo iure Congregationis negotiis religiosorum sodalium praepositae ad moderandam eorundem ordinationem; dispensationes respicientes locum, tempus, conditiones Eucharistiae sumendae, Sacri litandi, adservandi Augustissimi Sacramenti; aliaque id genus.

3. Quaestiones quoque de validitate matrimonii vel sacrae Ordinationis, aliasque ad Sacramentorum disciplinam spectantes, eadem Congregatio dirimit, incolumi iure Sancti Officii. Si tamen eadem Congregatio iudicaverit huiusmodi quaestiones iudiciario ordine servato esse tractandas, tunc eas ad Sacrae Romanae Rotae tribunal remittat.

4. Congregationi huic, quemadmodum ceteris omnibus quae sequuntur, erit Cardinalis Praefectus, qui praeerit sacro Ordini, aliquot Patribus Cardinalibus a Pontifice Summo eligendis conflato, cum *secretario* aliisque necessariis administris et consultoribus.

4. CONGREGATIO CONCILII.

1. Huic Sacrae Congregationi ea pars est negotiorum commissa, quae ad universam disciplinam Cleri saecularis populiue christiani refertur.

2. Quamobrem ipsius est curare ut Ecclesiae praecepta servantur, cuius generis sunt ieiunium (excepto eucharistico, quod ad Congregationem de disciplina Sacramentorum pertinet) abstinentia, decimae, observatio dierum festorum, cum facultate opportune relaxandi ab his legibus fideles; moderari quae Parochos et Canonicos spectant; item quae pias Sodalitates, pias uniones, pia legata, pia opera, Missarum stipes, beneficia aut officia, bona ecclesiastica, arcae nummarias, tributa dioecesana, aliaque huiusmodi, attingunt. Videt quoque de iis omnibus, quae ad immunitatem ecclesiasticam pertinent. Eidem Congregationi facultas est reservata eximendi a conditionibus requisitis ad assecutionem beneficiorum, quoties ad Ordinarios eorum collatio spectet.

3. Ad eandem pertinent ea omnia quae ad Conciliorum celebrationem et recognitionem, atque ad Episcoporum coetus seu *conferentias* referuntur, suppressa Congregatione speciali, quae hactenus fuit, pro Conciliorum revisione.

4. Est autem haec Congregatio tribunal competens seu legitimum in omnibus causis negotia eidem commissa spectantibus, quas ratione

disciplinae, seu, ut vulgo dicitur, *in linea disciplinari* pertractandas iudicaverit; cetera ad Sacram Romanam Rotam erunt deferenda.

5. Congregationi Concilii adiungitur et unitur, qua Congregatio specialis, ea quae *Lauretana* dicitur.

5. CONGREGATIO NEGOTIIS RELIGIOSORVM SODALIVM PRAEPOSITA.

1. Haec Sacra Congregatio iudicium sibi vindicat de iis tantum, quae ad Sodales religiosos utriusque sexus tum solemnibus, tum simplicibus votis adstrictos, et ad eos qui, quamvis sine votis, in **communi tamen vitam** agunt more religiosorum, itemque ad tertios ordines saeculares, in universum pertinent, sive res agatur inter religiosos ipsos, sive habita eorum ratione cum aliis.

2. Quapropter ea omnia sibi moderanda assumit, quae sive inter Episcopos et religiosos utriusque sexus sodales intercedunt, sive inter ipsos religiosos. Est autem tribunal competens in omnibus causis, quae ratione disciplinae, seu, ut dici solet, *in linea disciplinari* aguntur, religioso sodali sive convento sive actore; ceterae ad Sacram Romanam Rotam erunt deferendae, incolumi semper iure Sancti Officii circa causas ad hanc Congregationem spectantes.

3. Huic denique Congregationi reservatur concessio dispensationum a iure communi pro sodalibus religiosis.

6. CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

1. Sacrae huius Congregationis iurisdictio iis est circumscripta regionibus, ubi, sacra hierarchia nondum constituta, status missionis perseverat. Verum, quia regiones nonnullae, etsi hierarchia constituta, adhuc inchoatum aliquid praeseferunt, eas Congregationi de Propaganda Fide subiectas esse volumus.

2. Itaque a iurisdictione Congregations de Propaganda Fide exemptas et ad ius commune deductas decernimus—in *Europa*—ecclesiasticas provincias Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, et Hollandiae, ac dioecesim Luxemburgensem;—in *America*—provincias ecclesiasticas dominii Canadensis, Terrae Novae et Foederatarum Civitatum, seu *Statuum Unitorum*. Negotia proinde quae ad haec loca referuntur, tractanda in posterum non erunt penes Congregationem de Propaganda Fide, sed, pro varia eorundem natura, penes Congregationes ceteras.

3. Reliquae ecclesiasticae provinciae ac dioeceses, iurisdictioni Congregationis de Propaganda Fide hactenus subiectae, in eius iure ac potestate maneant. Pariter ad eam pertinere decernimus Vicariatus omnes Apostolicos, Praefecturas seu missiones quaslibet, eas quoque quae Congregationi a Negotiis ecclesiasticis extraordinariis modo subsunt.

4. Nihilominus, ut unitati regiminis consulatur, volumus ut Congregatio de Propaganda Fide ad peculiare alias Congregationes

deferat quaecumque aut fidem attingunt, aut matrimonium aut sacrorum rituum disciplinam.

5. Quod vero spectat ad sodales religiosos, eadem Congregatio sibi vindicet quidquid religiosos qua missionarios, sive uti singulos, sive simul sumptos tangit. Quidquid vero religiosos qua tales, sive uti singulos, sive simul sumptos attingit, ad Congregationem Religiosorum negotiis praepositam remittat aut relinquat.

6. Unitam habet Congregationem pro negotiis Rituum Orientalium, cui integra manent quae huc usque servata sunt.

7. Praefectura specialis pro re oeconomica esse desinit; omnium vero bonorum administratio, etiam *Reverendae Camerae Spoliorum*, ipsi Congregationi de Propaganda Fide committitur.

8. Cum hac Congregatione, coniungitur Coetus pro *unione Ecclesiarum dissidentium*.

7. CONGREGATIO INDICIS.

1. Huius sacrae Congregationis in posterum erit non solum delatos sibi libros diligenter excutere, eos si oportuerit prohibere, et exemptiones concedere; sed etiam ex officio inquirere, qua opportuniore licebit via, si quae in vulgus edantur scripta cuiuslibet generis, damnanda; et in memoriam Ordinariorum reducere quam religiose teneantur in perniciosa scripta animadvertere, eaque Sanctae Sedi denunciare, ad normam Const. *Officiorum*, XXV. Ian., MDCCCXCVII.

2. Cum vero librorum prohibitio persaepe propositam habeat catholicae fidei defensionem, qui finis est etiam Congregationis Sancti Officii, decernimus ut in posterum omnia quae ad librorum prohibitionem pertinent, eaque sola, utriusque Congregationis Patres Cardinales, Consultores, Administri secum invicem communicare possint, et omnes hac de re eodem secreto adstringantur.

8. CONGRERATIO SACRORVM RITVVM.

1. Haec Sacra Congregatio ius habet videndi et statuendi ea omnia, quae sacros ritus et caeremonias Ecclesiae Latinae proxime spectant, non autem quae latius ad sacros ritus referuntur, cuiusmodi sunt praecedentiae iura, aliaque id genus, de quibus, sive servato iudiciario ordine sive ratione disciplinae, hoc est, uti aiunt, *in linea disciplinari* disceptetur.

2. Eius proinde est praesertim advigilare ut sacri ritus ac caeremoniae diligenter serventur in Sacro celebrando, in Sacramentis administrandis, in divinis officiis persolvendis, in iis denique omnibus quae Ecclesiae Latinae cultum respiciunt; dispensationes opportunas concedere; insignia et honoris privilegia tam personalia et ad tempus, quam localia et perpetua, qua ad sacros ritus vel caeremonias pertineant, elargiri, et cavere ne in haec abusus irrepant.

3. Denique ea omnia exequi debet, quae ad beatificationem et canonisationem Sanctorum vel ad Sacras Reliquias quoquo modo referuntur.

4. Huic Congregationi adiunguntur *Coetus liturgicus*, *Coetus historico-liturgicus* et *Coetus pro Sacro Concentu*.

9. CONGREGATIO CAEREMONIALIS.

Haec Sacra Congregatio iura hactenus ipsi tributa integra servat; ideoque ad eam pertinet moderatio caeremoniarum in Sacello Aulaque Pontificali servandarum, et sacrarum functionum, quas Patres Cardinales extra pontificale sacellum peragunt; itemque quaestiones cognoscit de praecedentia tum Patrum Cardinalium, tum Legatorum, quos variae nationes ad Sanctam Sedem mittunt.

10. CONGREGATIO PRO NEGOTIIS ECCLESIASTICIS EXTRAORDINARIIS.

In ea tantum negotia Sacra haec Congregatio incumbit, quae eius examini subiiciuntur a Summo Pontifice per Cardinalem *Secretarium Status*, praesertim ex illis quae cum legibus civilibus coniunctum aliquid habent et ad pacta conventa cum variis civitatibus referuntur.

II. CONGREGATIO STUDIORUM.

Est huic Sacrae Congregationi commissa moderatio studiorum in quibus versari debeant maiora athenaea, seu quas vocant Universitates, seu Facultates, quae ab Ecclesiae auctoritate dependent, comprehensis iis quae a religiosae alicuius familiae sodalibus administrantur. Novas institutiones perpendit approbatque; facultatem concedit academicos gradus conferendi, et, ubi agatur de viro singulari doctrina commendato, potest eos ipsa conferre.

II.

TRIBUNALIA.

I. SACRA POENITENTIARIA.

Huius sacri iudicii seu tribunalis iurisdictio coarctatur ad ea dumtaxat quae forum internum, etiam non sacramentale, respiciunt. Itaque, externi fori dispensationibus circa matrimonium ad Congregationem de disciplina Sacramentorum remissis, hoc tribunal pro foro interno gratias largitur, absolutiones, dispensationes, commutationes, sanationes, condonationes; excutit praeterea quaestiones conscientiae, easque dirimit.

2. SACRA ROMANA ROTA.

Quum Sacrae Romanae Rotae tribunal, antea actis temporibus omni laude cumulatum, hoc aevo variis de causis iudicare ferme destiterit, factum est ut Sacrae Congregationes forensibus contentionibus

nimum gravarentur. Huic incommodo ut occurratur, iis inhaerentes, quae a Decessoribus Nostris Xysto V., Innocentio XII. et Pio VI. sancita fuerunt, non solum iubemus "per Sacras Congregationes non amplius recipi nec agnosci causas contentiosas, tam civiles quam criminales, ordinem iudicarium cum processu et probationibus requirentes" (Litt. Secretariae Status, XVII. Aprilis, MDCCXXVIII.); sed praeterea decernimus ut causae omnes contentiosae non maiores, quae in Romana Curia aguntur, in posterum devolvantur ad Sacrae Romanae Rotae tribunal, quod hiscelitteris rursus in exercitium revocamus iuxta *Legem propriam*, quam in appendice praesentis Constitutionis ponimus, salvo tamen iure Sacrarum Congregationum, prout superius praescriptum est.

3. SIGNATURA APOSTOLICA.

Item supremum Signaturae Apostolicae tribunal restituendum censemus, et praesentibus litteris restituimus, seu melius instituimus, iuxta modum qui in memorata *Lege* determinatur, antiqua ordinatione tribunalium *Signaturae papalis gratiae et iustitiae* suppressa.

III.

OFFICIA.

I. CANCELLARIA APOSTOLICA.

1. Huic officio praesidet unus ex S. R. E. Cardinalibus, qui posthac Cancellarii, non autem Vice Cancellarii nomen assumet. Ipse iuxta pervetustam consuetudinem in sacris Consistoriis, ex officio, notarii munere fungitur.

2. Ad Cancellariae officium in posterum hoc unum tamquam proprium reservatur munus, Apostolicas expedire litteras *sub plumbo* circa beneficiorum consistorialium provisionem, circa novarum dioecesium et capitulorum institutionem, et pro aliis maioribus Ecclesiae negotiis conficiendis.

3. Unus erit earum expediendarum modus, hoc est per *viam Cancellariae*, iuxta normam seorsim dandam, sublati iis modis qui dicuntur per *viam secretam, de Camera et de Curia*.

4. Expedientur memoratae litterae seu *bullae* de mandata Congregationis Consistorialis circa negotia ad eius iurisdictionem spectantia, aut de mandato Summi Pontificis circa alia negotia, servatis ad unguem in singulis casibus ipsius mandati terminis.

5. Suppresso collegio Praelatorum, qui dicuntur *Abbreviatores maioris vel minoris residentiae*, seu *de parco maiori vel minori*; quae ipsius erant munia in subscribendis apostolicis bullis transferuntur ad collegium Protonotariorum Apostolicorum, qui vocantur *participantes de numero*.

2. DATARIA APOSTOLICA.

1. Huic officio praeest unus ex S. R. E. Cardinalibus, qui in posterum Datarii, non vero Pro-Datarii nomen obtinebit.

2. Ad Datariam in posterum hoc unum tamquam proprium ministerium tribuitur, cognoscere de idoneitate eorum qui optant ad beneficia non consistorialia Apostolicae Sedi reservata; conficere et expedire Apostolicas litteras pro eorum collatione; eximere in conferendo beneficio a conditionibus requisitis; curare pensiones et onera quae Summus Pontifex in memoratis conferendis beneficiis impoverit.

3. In his omnibus agendis normas peculiare sibi proprias, aliasque seorsim dandas servabit.

3. CAMERA APOSTOLICA.

Huic Officio cura est atque administratio bonorum ac iurium temporalium Sanctae Sedis, quo tempore praesertim haec vacua habeatur. Ei officio praeest S. R. E. Cardinalis Camerarius, qui in suo munere, Sede ipsa vacua, exercendo se geret ad normas exhibitae a Const. *Vacante Sede Apostolica*, XXV. Dec. MDCCCXVI.

4. SECRETARIA STATVS.

Officium hoc, cuius est supremus moderator Cardinalis a *Secretis Status*, hoc est a publicis negotiis, triplici parte constabit. Prima pars in negotiis extraordinariis versabitur, quae Congregationi iisdem praepositae examinanda subiici debent, ceteris, pro diversa eorum natura, ad peculiare Congregationes remissis; altera in ordinaria negotia incumbet, ad eamque, inter cetera, pertinebit honoris insignia quaeque concedere tum ecclesiastica tum civilia, iis demptis quae Antistiti pontificali domui Praeposito sunt reservata; tertia expeditioni Apostolicorum Brevium, quae a variis Congregationibus ei committuntur, vacabit.—Primae praeerit *Secretarius* Congregationis pro negotiis extraordinariis; alteri *Substitutus* pro negotiis ordinariis; tertiae *Cancellarius* Brevium Apostolicorum. Inter harum partium praesides primus est *Secretarius* Sacrae Congregationis negotiis extraordinariis praepositae, alter *Substitutus* pro ordinariis negotiis.

5. SECRETARIAE BREVIVM AD PRINCIPES ET EPISTOLARVM LATINARVM.

Duplex hoc officium sua munia, ut antea, servabit, latine scribendi acta Summi Pontificis.

In posterum vero in omnibus Apostolicis Litteris, sive a *Cancellaria* sive a *Dataria* expediendis, initium anni ducetur, non a die Incarnationis Dominicae, hoc est a die XXV. mensis Martii, sed a Kalendis Ianuariis.

Itaque Congregationes, Tribunalia, Officia, quae diximus, posthac Romanam Curiam constituent, servata eorum quae ante Nostras has litteras exstabant, propria constitutione, nisi immutata fuerit secundum superius praescripta aut secundum legem ac normas sive generales sive speciales quae Constitutioni huic adiiciuntur.

Congregatio quae dicitur *Reverendae fabricae S. Petri*, in posterum unam sibi curandam habebit rem familiarem Basilicae Principis Apostolorum, servatis ad unguem in hac parte normis a Benedicto XIV. statutis Const. *Quanta curarum* die XV. mensis Novembris MDCCLI. data.

Coetus *studiis provehendis* sive *Sacrae Scripturae*, sive *historiae*; *Obulo S. Petri administrando*; *Fidei in Urbe praeservandae*, permanent in statu quo ante.

Sublata Congregatione *Visitationis Apostolicae Urbis*, quae ipsius erant iura et munia, ad peculiarem Patrum Cardinalium coetum, penes urbis Vicariatum constituendum, deferimus.

In omnibus autem et singulis superius recensitis Congregationibus, Tribunalibus, Officiis hoc in primis solemne sit, ut nil grave et extraordinarium agatur, nisi a moderatoribus eorundem Nobis Nostrisque pro tempore Successoribus fuerit ante significatum.

Praeterea, sententiae quaevis, sive gratiae via, sive iustitiae, pontificia approbatione indigent, exceptis iis pro quibus eorundem Officiorum, Tribunalium et Congregationum moderatoribus speciales facultates tributae sint, exceptisque semper sententiis tribunalis Sacrae Rotae et Signaturae Apostolicae de ipsarum competentia latis.

Huic Constitutioni accedunt leges propriae, ac normae tum generales tum particulares, quibus disciplina et modus tractandi negotia in Congregationibus, Tribunalibus, Officiis praestituitur; quas leges et normas ad unguem ab omnibus observari mandamus.

Atque haec valere quidem debent Apostolica Sede plena; vacuâ enim standum legibus et regulis in memorata Constitutione *Vacante Sede Apostolica* statutis.

Decernentes praesentes Litteras firmas, validas et efficaces semper esse ac fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere et illis ad quos spectat aut pro tempore quomodolibet spectabit, in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, atque irritum esse et inane si secus super his a quoquam contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Nostra et Cancellariae Apostolicae regula de iure quaesito non tollendo, aliisque Constitutionibus et ordinationibus Apostolicis, vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis statutis, consuetudinibus, ceterisque contrariis quibuslibet etiam specialissima mentione dignis.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, anno Incarnationis

Dominicae millesimo nongentesimo octavo, die festo Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, III. Kal. Iulias, Pontificatus Nostri anno quinto.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *A Secretis Status.*

A. CARD. DI PIETRO, *Pro-Datarivs.*

VISA

DE CVRIA I. DE AQVILA E VICECOMITIBVS,

Loco ✠ Plumbi,

Reg. in Secret Brevium,

V. CVGNONIVS.

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION ON THE ROMAN CURIA.

PIUS BISHOP

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD.

For Perpetual Memory.

WITH wise design the Pontiff Sixtus V., of holy memory, following in the footsteps of his predecessors and perfecting what had been begun by them, decided to increase the number and define the limits of the sacred bodies of Cardinals, or the Roman Congregations, some of which had been already instituted for the transaction of certain matters. He therefore, by the apostolic letters beginning with the word "Immensa," of January 22, 1587, established fifteen of these congregations, that, "dividing among them and the other offices of the Roman Curia the immense weight of the cares and affairs" habitually brought before the Holy See, it might be no longer necessary to treat of and deliberate upon so many things in Consistory, and at the same time that controversies might be more diligently gone into and a more speedy and easier solution be given to the business of those who apply to the Supreme Pontiff from all sides in the interests of religion and devotion, to seek justice, to ask favors or for other reasons.

The utility accruing from these sacred congregations for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, the administration of justice and the relief of the Roman Pontiffs, themselves overpowered by daily increasing cares and affairs, is shown by the history of the Church and is well known to all.

But in the course of time the organization of the Roman Curia, mainly effected by Sixtus V. in the above mentioned letters apostolic,

lapsed from its original state. The number of the Roman Congregations was increased or diminished according to the necessities of time and circumstance, and even the jurisdiction originally attributed to the different congregations underwent changes either by new enactments of the Roman Pontiffs or by the gradual growth of customs which became accepted. The result is that to-day the jurisdiction, or competence, of each of them is not quite clear to all nor is it well apportioned, that many of the sacred congregations have the right to define the law on the same matters, and that some of them have been reduced to the transaction of very little business, while others are overcharged with work.

For these reasons many Bishops and thoughtful men, especially the Roman Cardinals, both in writing and orally, and both with our predecessor Leo XIII., of happy memory, and with ourself, have frequently urged that suitable remedies should be provided for the inconveniences above mentioned. And we took pains to make partial provision in our letters "*Romanis Pontificibus*," of December 7, 1903; by those "*Quae in Ecclesiae bonum*," of January 28, 1904, and again by those "*Sacrae Congregationi super negotiis*," of May 26, 1906.

But now that there is also the question of the codification of the ecclesiastical laws, it has seemed highly fitting that a beginning should be made with the Roman Curia so that, once this has been organized suitably and in a manner clear to all, it may be in a position to perform more easily its work for the Roman Pontiff and the Church and to be of the greatest possible assistance.

Wherefore, after having taken counsel with several of the Roman Cardinals, we have determined and we do decree that the Congregations, Tribunals and Offices which compose the Roman Curia and to which the affairs of the Universal Church are referred for treatment shall, after the autumn holidays of the current year, that is, after the third day of November, 1908, be only those, besides the usual Sacred Consistories, which are defined in the present constitution, and which shall remain divided and constituted in number, order and competence by the laws which here follow:

THE SACRED CONGREGATIONS.

I. THE CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE.

1. This sacred congregation, over which the Supreme Pontiff presides, guards the teaching of faith and morals.
2. To it alone, therefore, belongs the judgment of heresy and of other crimes which lead to a suspicion of heresy.
3. To it also is devolved all matters concerning indulgences, both as regards the doctrine and as concerns practice.

4. Everything appertaining to the precepts of the Church, such as the abstinences, fasts and feasts to be observed, is now transferred from this sacred congregation and handed over to the Congregation of the Council; everything relating to the election of Bishops belongs to the Consistorial Congregation; the relaxation of religious vows made in religious institutes belongs to the congregation assigned for the affairs of religious societies.

5. Although a special congregation is established for the discipline of the sacraments, nevertheless the Holy Office preserves intact its faculty to treat of those questions which concern what is known as the Pauline Privilege and the impediments *disparitatis cultus* and *mixtae religionis*, as well as those connected with dogmatic teaching on matrimony, as also on the other sacraments.

2. THE CONSISTORIAL CONGREGATION.

1. This sacred congregation comprises two distinct parts.

2. To the first appertains not only the charge of preparing what is to be done in the consistories, but also, in places not subject to the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, of founding new dioceses and chapters, both cathedral and collegiate; of dividing dioceses already constituted; of electing Bishops, apostolic administrators and adjutors and auxiliaries of Bishops; of instituting the canonical investigations or *processus* concerning those to be elected and of diligently sifting the acts of these processes; of ascertaining the knowledge of those who are to be elected. But when the men to be elected, or the dioceses to be constituted or divided are outside Italy, the officials of the Office for Public Affairs, commonly called the Secretariate of State, shall themselves receive the documents and draw up the statement (*Positionem*), to be submitted to the Consistorial Congregation.

3. The second part embraces all those matters which concern the government of the different dioceses not subject to the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and which hitherto belonged to the Congregation of the Bishops and of the Council, and are now transferred to the Consistorial Congregation. To this latter, therefore, for the future belongs the vigilance over the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of the obligations by which ordinaries are bound, the cognizance of the written reports of Bishops on the state of their dioceses, the ordering of apostolic visitations, the examination of what has been done in them, and after a faithful exposition made to us each time, the ordering of what may seem necessary or opportune; finally, everything appertaining to the government, discipline, temporal administration and studies of the seminaries.

4. It shall be the province of this congregation, when conflicts

of law arise, to solve doubts concerning the competence of the sacred congregations.

5. Of this sacred council the Supreme Pontiff is to be the Prefect. And to it the Cardinal Secretary of the Holy Office and the Cardinal Secretary of State shall always be attached *ex officio*, besides the others whom the Supreme Pontiff may think well to make members of it.

6. The Secretary shall always be a Cardinal selected for this office by the Supreme Pontiff; with him there shall be a prelate with the title of Assessor, who shall also fill the office of Secretary of the Sacred College of the Fathers Cardinals, and under him a sufficient number of officials.

7. Consultors of this congregation shall be the Assessor of the Holy Office and the Secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs while in office; to these shall be added others elected by the Supreme Pontiff.

3. CONGREGATION ON THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

1. To this sacred congregation is assigned the entire legislation concerning the discipline of the Seven Sacraments, without prejudice to the authority of the Congregation of the Holy Office according to the provisions above defined, and of the Congregation of Sacred Rites regarding the ceremonies to be observed in the performing, administration and reception of the sacraments, which were hitherto decided or granted by other congregations, tribunals or offices of the Roman Curia.

2. So also to this congregation are assigned all those matters connected with the discipline of matrimony, such as dispensations in *foro externo* for the poor as well as for the rich, *sanationes in radice*, dispensations *super rato*, the separation of married couples, the restitution of birthright or legitimation of offspring, as well as in the discipline of the other sacraments, such as dispensations for candidates for orders, without prejudice to the right of the Congregation for the Affairs of Religious to regulate the ordinations of religious; dispensations concerning the place, time and conditions for the reception of the Eucharist, the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, the reservation of the Most August Sacrament and the other matters of the same nature.

3. The same congregation decides, without prejudice to the right of the Holy Office, questions regarding the discipline of the sacraments. But when this congregation decides that any such questions are to be treated by judicial process, then it shall hand them over to the tribunal of the Sacred Roman Rota.

4. For this congregation, as well as for the others that follow,

there shall be a Cardinal Prefect who shall preside over the sacred order consisting of a number of Fathers Cardinals to be elected by the Supreme Pontiff, with a secretary and the other necessary officials and consultors.

4. THE CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL.

1. To this sacred congregation is committed that branch of affairs which relates to the universal discipline of the secular clergy and of the Christian people.

2. It is, therefore, its province to provide for the observance of the precepts of the Church, such as fasts (except the Eucharistic fast, which belongs to the Congregation on the Discipline of the Sacraments), abstinence, tithes, the observance of feasts, with the faculty of releasing the faithful from these laws on occasion; the government of everything relating to parish priests and canons and of all things affecting pious sodalities, pious unions, pious legacies, pious works, honorariums for Masses, benefices or offices, ecclesiastical property, funds of money, diocesan tributes and other affairs of the same kind. It sees also to everything relating to ecclesiastical immunity. To the same congregation is reserved the faculty of dispensing from the conditions required for the obtaining of benefices when the conferring of these belongs to the ordinary.

3. To it also appertains all that regards the celebration and recognition of councils and gatherings or conferences of Bishops, as the special congregation till now in existence for the revision of councils is suppressed.

4. This congregation, too, is the competent or legitimate tribunal in all causes relating to the affairs committed to it which it shall decide are to be treated in a disciplinary manner or in *linea disciplinari*, as the phrase goes; the others are to be handed over to the Sacred Roman Rota.

5. To the Congregation of the Council is added and united as a special congregation that known as the Lauretan.

5. THE CONGREGATION FOR THE AFFAIRS OF RELIGIOUS.

1. This sacred congregation decides only those matters throughout the world which relate to the affairs of religious of both sexes, whether bound by simple or solemn vows, and of those who, although without vows, lead a life in common after the manner of religious, and also of secular third orders, and whether the matters to be treated are between religious themselves or relate to them and others.

2. It therefore assumes the regulation of all matters arising either between Bishops and religious of both sexes or between religious themselves. It is also the competent tribunal in all causes which are

treated in a disciplinary manner, or in *linea disciplinari*, when a religious is either defendant or complainant; other causes are to be handed over to the Sacred Roman Rota, without prejudice, however, to the right of the Holy Office in the causes appertaining to that sacred congregation.

3. Finally, to this sacred congregation is reserved the concession of dispensations from the common law for religious.

6. THE CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

1. The jurisdiction of this sacred congregation is limited to those regions in which the sacred hierarchy not being yet constituted the missionary state still exists. But as there are some regions which although they possess a hierarchy are still somewhat inchoate, it is our will that these be subject to the Congregation de Propaganda Fide.

2. Wherefore, from the jurisdiction of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide we decree the transference under the common law: in Europe, of the ecclesiastical provinces of England, Scotland, Ireland and Holland, and of the Diocese of Luxembourg; in America, of the ecclesiastical provinces of the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland and the United States. Hence, affairs relating to these places shall for the future not be treated by the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, but by the other congregations according to the nature of the business.

3. The other ecclesiastical provinces and dioceses hitherto subject to the jurisdiction of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide are to remain under its right and authority. So, too, we decree that to it shall belong all vicariates apostolic, prefectures and missions whatsoever, including those which are at present in a special manner under the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs.

3. Still, in order to provide for unity of government, it is our will that the Congregation de Propaganda Fide hand over to the other special congregations everything concerning the faith, or matrimony, or the discipline of the sacred rites.

5. As regards religious, the same congregation takes upon itself everything affecting religious, whether singly or in bodies, considered as missionaries. But all things affecting religious as religious, both individually and as bodies, it shall remit or leave to the Congregation for the Affairs of Religious.

6. To it is united the Congregation for the Affairs of Oriental Rites which are to continue entirely as before.

7. The special prefecture for administration ceases to exist, and the administration of all the property, including that of the Reverenda

Camera Spoliorum, is committed to the Congregation de Propaganda Fide itself.

8. With this sacred congregation is joined the Commission for the Union of the Dissident Churches.

7. THE CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX.

1. For the future it shall be the province of this sacred congregation not only to examine diligently the books delated to it, to prohibit them if this should seem well, and to concede dispensations, but also officially to investigate in the best way available whether writings of any kind that should be condemned are being circulated, and to remind the ordinaries how solemnly they are bound to condemn pernicious writings and to denounce them to the Holy See in conformity with the Constitution *Officiorum* of January 25, 1897.

2. As the prohibition of books has very frequently the scope of defense of the Catholic faith, which is also the object of the Congregation of the Holy Office, we decree that in future in all things, and in those alone relating to the prohibition of books, the Fathers Cardinals, the consultors and the officers of both congregations may communicate with one another and that all of them in this matter shall be bound by the same secret.

8. THE CONGREGATION OF THE SACRED RITES.

1. This sacred congregation has the right of examining and decreeing all things which relate proximately to the sacred rites and ceremonies of the Latin Church, but not those which in a broader sense are related to the sacred rites, such as the laws of precedence and other matters of that kind which are to be treated either according to judicial process or in a disciplinary manner or in *linea disciplinari*.

2. It is, therefore, especially its province to watch over the diligent observance of the sacred ritual and ceremonial in the celebration of Mass, in the administration of the sacraments, in the performance of the divine offices, in short, over all that regards the worship of the Latin Church; to grant opportune dispensations; to bestow insignia and privileges of honor, both personal and temporary, as well as local and perpetual, relating to the sacred rites and ceremonies, and to prevent the introduction of abuses in these matters.

3. Finally, it has to deal with everything relating in any way to the beatification and canonization of the saints or to the sacred relics.

4. To this congregation are joined the Liturgical Commission, the Historico-Liturgical Commission and the Commission for Sacred Music.

9. THE CEREMONIAL CONGREGATION.

This sacred congregation retains all the rights hitherto attributed to it; hence to it appertain the regulation of the ceremonies to be observed in the Pontifical Chapel and Court and of the sacred functions which the Fathers Cardinals perform outside the Pontifical Chapel; it also takes cognizance of the question affecting the precedence both of the Fathers Cardinals and of the Legates whom many nations send to the Holy See.

10. THE CONGREGATION FOR EXTRAORDINARY ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

This sacred congregation concerns itself only with those matters which are submitted to its examination by the Supreme Pontiff through the Cardinal Secretary of State, and especially with such of them as have some connection with civil laws and relate to the pacts entered upon with different States.

II. THE CONGREGATION OF STUDIES.

To this sacred congregation is committed the regulation of the studies which are to be gone through in the major athenæums known as universities or faculties, which depend on the authority of the Church, including those which are administered by the members of religious societies. It examines and approves new institutions; it grants the faculty for the conferring of academic degrees, and may confer them itself in the case of men distinguished for special learning.

II.

TRIBUNALS.

I. THE SACRED PENITENTIARIA.

The jurisdiction of this sacred court or tribunal is limited entirely to those things which regard the forum internum, non-sacramental as well as sacramental. Hence matrimonial dispensations of the forum externum being assigned to the Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments, this tribunal for the forum internum concedes favors, absolutions, dispensations, commutations, sanations, condonations; moreover, it examines questions of conscience and decides them.

2. THE SACRED ROMAN ROTA.

As the Tribunal of the Sacred Roman Rota, which in former times was an object of universal praise, has in these times through various causes almost ceased to judge, the result has been that the Sacred

Congregations have been burdened excessively with forensic cases. To meet this evil, following the lines laid down by our predecessors, Sixtus V., Innocent XII. and Pius VI., we not only ordain "that for the future contentious cases, civil as well as criminal, requiring judicial procedure with trial and proofs, shall not be received or taken cognizance of by the Sacred Congregations (letter of the Secretariate of State April 17, 1728), but we moreover decree that all contentious cases, not major ones, which are treated in the Roman Curia shall for the future devolve to the Tribunal of the Sacred Roman Rota, which we do by these letters again call into exercise according to the special law which we place in the appendix of the present Constitution, without prejudice, however, to the rights of the Sacred Congregations as above set forth.

3. THE APOSTOLIC SEGNETURA.

We have also deemed it well to restore the supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Segnatura and by these present letters we do restore it or rather we institute it in the manner determined in the above mentioned law, suppressing the ancient organization of the Papal Segnatura of Grace and Justice.

III.

OFFICES.

I. THE APOSTOLIC CANCELLERIA.

1. This office has for president one of the Cardinals of Holy Roman Church, who for the future shall assume the title of Chancellor instead of Vice Chancellor. According to very ancient custom he fulfills ex officio the office of notary in the Sacred Consistories.

2. Henceforth the sole proper function reserved to the office of the Cancelleria shall be that of forwarding sub plumbo the apostolic letters concerning the provision of consistorial benefices, the institution of new dioceses and chapters and the transaction of the other greater affairs of the Church.

3. There shall be only one manner of forwarding these, that is per viam Cancellariae, according to rules to be given separately, the former methods known as per viam secretam, de Camera and de Curia being suppressed.

4. The above mentioned letters or bulls shall be sent by command of the Consistorial Congregation concerning the affairs belonging to its jurisdiction, or by command of the Supreme Pontiff concerning other affairs, the terms of the mandate being in each case observed to the letter.

5. With the suppression of the College of Prelates known as *Abbreviatores majoris vel minoris residentiae*, or *de parco majori vel minori*, their office in the signing of apostolic bulls is transferred to the College of Protonotaries Apostolic called *participantes de numero*.

2. THE APOSTOLIC DATARIA.

1. This office is under the presidency of one of the Cardinals of Holy Roman Church, who shall for the future have the title of Datary and not that of Pro-Datary.

2. For the future the one special function of the Dataria is to be that of taking cognizance of the fitness of those who aspire to non-consistorial benefices reserved to the Apostolic See; to draw up and forward the apostolic letters conferring these benefices; to dispense from the requisite conditions for the conferring of these benefices; to look after the pensions and charges which the Supreme Pontiff shall have imposed for the conferring of them.

3. In the performance of all this it shall observe the rules special to it which are to be given separately.

3. THE APOSTOLIC CAMERA.

To this office belong the care and the administration of the property and temporal rights of the Holy See, especially during the periods of vacancy. It is presided over by a Cardinal Chamberlain of Holy Roman Church, who in the fulfillment of his office during the vacancy of the see shall be governed by the rules contained in the Constitution *Vacante Sede Apostolica* of December 25, 1904.

4. THE SECRETARIATE OF STATE.

This office, of which the supreme ruler is the Cardinal Secretary of State, that is, of public affairs, will consist of three parts. The first part will be concerned with extraordinary affairs, which shall be submitted for examination to the congregation assigned for them, the others being handed over, according to their nature, to the special congregations to which they belong; the second shall deal with ordinary affairs, and to it, among other things, shall belong the right of granting all marks of honor both ecclesiastical and civil, with the exception of those reserved to the prelate who presides over the Pontifical household; the third shall occupy itself with the sending of the apostolic briefs committed to it by the various congregations. Over the first part shall preside the Secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs; over the second the Substitute for ordinary affairs; over the third the Chancellor of the apostolic briefs. Among the presidents of these parts the first is the

Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs, the second the Substitute for ordinary affairs.

5. THE SECRETARIATES OF BRIEFS TO PRINCES AND OF LATIN LETTERS.

This double office shall perform as heretofore its functions of writing in Latin the acts of the Supreme Pontiff.

But for the future in all apostolic letters sent either by the Cancellaria or by the Dataria the beginning of the year shall be taken not from the day of the Incarnation of Our Lord, that is, from March 25, but from the 1st of January.

Wherefore the Congregations, Tribunals and Offices which we have mentioned shall constitute the Roman Curia, preserving their own constitutions as in existence before these our letters, unless in as far as they may have been changed by the above prescriptions or according to the law and to the rules, general or special, added to this Constitution.

The congregation known as that of the Reverenda Fabrica S. Petri shall for the future have as its sole care the domestic affairs of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, in this observing to the letter the rules laid down by Benedict XIV. in the Constitution *Quanta curarum* of November 15, 1751.

The commissions for the promotion of the study of Scripture and of history, for the administration of Peter Pence, for the Preservation of the Faith in the City remain in their former state.

With the removal of the Congregation for the Apostolic Visitation of the City, its right and functions we transfer to a special commission of Fathers Cardinals to be constituted at the vicariate of the city.

But for all and several of the above mentioned Congregations, Tribunals and Offices let this first of all be a solemn rule: that nothing grave and out of the ordinary be done until it shall have previously been made known to us and to our successors for the time being by the rulers of the same.

Moreover, all sentences, whether of grace or justice, require the Pontifical approval, exception being made for those for which special faculties have been granted to the rulers of the said Offices, Tribunals and Congregations, and always excepting the sentences of the Tribunal of the Sacred Rota and of the Apostolic Segnatura passed by them within their competence.

To this Constitution are added special laws and rules, both general and special, by which the discipline and the method of treating affairs in the Congregations, Tribunals and Offices is regulated; which laws and rules we order to be scrupulously observed by all.

And these are to have force while the Apostolic See is occupied, for when it is vacant the laws and rules laid down in the above mentioned Constitution *Vacante Sede Apostolica* are to hold.

Decreeing the present letters to be of force, valid and efficacious, now and in the future, and to have and obtain their plenary and integral effects, and to be in all things and for all things of force on behalf of those whom it concerns or shall in any way concern for the time being, and that any attempt against these made by anybody shall be null and void. Notwithstanding our rule and that of the Apostolic Cancellaria regarding the non-abolition of acquired rights, and the Apostolic Constitution and Ordinances, or statutes based on any other sanction, customs and anything else whatsoever, even those calling for special mention, to the contrary.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eight, on the feast of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, June 29, in the fifth year of our Pontificate.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretary of State.*

A. CARD. DI PIETRO, *Pro-Datary.*

Authenticated:

I. of the Viscounts De Aquila of the Curia.

Loco ✕ Plumbi.

Reg. in the Secr. of Briefs.

V. CUGNONI.

EXHORTATION

TO THE CATHOLIC CLERGY OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD.

PIUS X.,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

ON THE OCCASION

OF THE FIFTIETH YEAR OF HIS PRIESTHOOD.

PIUS X., POPE.

Beloved Sons, Health and the Apostolic Benediction:

DEELPLY impressive and full of warning are those words of the Apostle of the Gentiles to the Hebrews when, admonishing them of the duty of obedience to their superiors, he solemnly affirmed: "For they watch as being to render an account of your souls" (xiii., 17). But if this sentence applies to all who rule in the Church, it falls in a special way on us, who, unworthy as we are, have from God the supreme authority in it. Hence we are night and day full of solicitude, nor do we ever cease meditating upon and working for whatever may tend to the salvation and increase of the Lord's flock. But there is one subject that mainly occupies us: that all those in sacred orders should be completely what their state requires them to be. For we are convinced that it is principally on this that the present welfare and the future hopes of religion depend. It was on this account that immediately on entering upon the Pontificate, although taking the clergy as a whole we found many reasons for praise, we yet deemed it well to exhort most earnestly our venerable brothers, the Bishops of the whole Catholic world, to bend all their constancy and all their energy to the task of forming Christ in those who are duly destined to form Christ in others. We know well the good-will shown by the sacred prelates in this matter; we know with what foresight and diligence they strive assiduously to lead the clergy to virtue, and for this they have merited not so much praise as the open expression of our thanks.

But while we are glad that as a result of the work of the Bishops many of the clergy have been imbued with a heavenly ardor, reviving or intensifying in them the grace they received with the laying on of hands of the priesthood, there is still ground for complaint that some others in different countries do not so approve themselves that the faithful looking on them may see in them as in a mirror an example for them to imitate, as should be the case. To

such as these we wish in this letter to open our heart, as the heart of a father beating with anxious tenderness at the sight of a sick son. For this reason, therefore, we add our exhortations to the exhortations of the Bishops, premising that while they are designed principally to bring back the erring and to rouse the slothful to a better life, they may serve as a stimulus to the others. We wish to point out the way in which all may more earnestly strive every day to be in truth what the apostle has admirably described as "men of God," and answer to the just expectation of the Church. Nothing that we shall say will be entirely unfamiliar to you or new to anybody, but it will be something that should certainly be remembered by all, and God gives us the hope that our words will not be without much fruit. What we earnestly beg is: "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man who, according to God, is created in justice and holiness of truth" (Eph. iv., 23, 24). And this shall be the most beautiful and acceptable gift you can offer us on the occasion of the fiftieth year of our priesthood. And while we, "in a contrite heart and in the spirit of humility" (Dan. iii., 39), go over with God the years we have passed in the priesthood, we shall be seen in a manner to expiate the human shortcomings in them that are to be lamented, admonishing you and urging you "that you may walk worthy of God, in all things pleasing" (Coloss. i., 10). And in this appeal we shall be consulting not merely your own profit, but that of all Catholic people, for your profit cannot be separated from theirs. In truth, it is not possible for a priest to be good or bad for himself alone, for the character and life of a priest cannot but have its deep influence on the people. When a priest is good, what a great blessing it is for his surroundings!

Hence, beloved sons, we begin our exhortation by stimulating you to that holiness of life which the dignity of your rank demands of you. For the priest is not priest for himself alone, but for others: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God" (Hebr. v., 1). Christ Himself has pointed out this truth when He explained the end for which the priest's action is destined by comparing it with that of salt and of light. The priest is the light of the world, the salt of the earth, and it must be clear to all that he is this by proclaiming the truth of Christianity. But is it not equally clear that the priesthood will be of but little use if the priest compromises by his conduct what he preaches in words? His hearers, contumeliously indeed, but not without reason, object: "They profess that they know God, but in their works they deny Him" (Titus i., 16); they reject the teaching and fail to profit by the light of the priest. Hence Christ Himself,

made in the form of the priests, taught first by His action, then by His words: "Jesus began to do and to teach" (Acts i., 1). So, too, if sanctity is neglected, the priest cannot be in any way the salt of the earth, for what is itself corrupt and contaminated is quite unfitted for preserving soundness, and when sanctity is lacking corruption cannot but be present. Wherefore Christ, dwelling on the same similitude, calls such priests salt without savor, "good for nothing" any more but to be cast out, and therefore "to be trodden on by men" (Matth. v., 13).

All this becomes still more clear when it is remembered that we do not possess the office of the priesthood in our own name, but in that of Jesus Christ: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (I. Cor. iv., 1); "for Christ therefore we are ambassadors" (II. Cor. v., 20). It was on this account, too, that Christ numbered us not among His servants, but among His friends: "I will not now call you servants. . . . But I have called you friends, because all things whatsoever I have heard of my father I have made known to you. . . . I have chosen you and appointed you, that you may go and bear fruit" (John xv., 15). It is for us, therefore, to bear the person of Christ, and the embassy conferred by Him is to be so carried out that we may attain the aims He set for us. And since the highest sign of friendship "is to love and reject the same things" as the friend, we are bound as friends to feel within us what was also in Christ Jesus, who is "holy, innocent, undefiled" (Hebr. vii., 28). So that as His legates we must win the faith of men to His teachings and His law, by observing them first ourselves; that as partakers of His power in freeing souls from the bonds of sin, we must strive with all our strength to avoid being ourselves implicated in sin; but most of all as His ministers in the most august sacrifice, which is renewed with perennial virtue for the life of the world, we must be filled with the spirit with which He offered Himself to God, an immaculate victim, on the altar of the cross. For if so much sanctity was required of the priests of old, under appearance and in symbol, what is to be expected of us when the victim is Christ Himself? Very aptly St. Charles Borromeo in his addresses to the clergy insisted: "If we remembered, beloved brethren, how many wonderful things the Lord God has placed in our hands, what force this thought would have in impelling us to lead lives worthy of ecclesiastics! What is it that the Lord has not put in my hands when He has put in them His own only begotten Son, co-eternal and co-equal with Himself? In my hands He has put all His treasures, sacraments and graces; He has put the souls than which nothing is dearer to Him, which in His love He pre-

ferred to Himself, which He redeemed with His blood. In my hands He has placed heaven, which I can open and close to others. . . . How, therefore, can I ever be so ungrateful for such bounty and love as to sin against Him, as to offend His honor, as to soil this body which is His, as to stain this dignity, this life consecrated to Him?"

This holiness of life, of which it will be well to treat at length, the Church seeks to promote with great and constant solicitude. To this end her sacred seminaries have been instituted, where if the youths who grow up in the hope of entering the ranks of the clergy are imbued with letters and knowledge, they are also, and principally, to be formed in all piety from their tender years. When she gradually and at long intervals promotes the candidates for orders, like a good mother she never spares her exhortations on the necessity of sanctity. It is sweet to recall here these exhortations. When she first chose us for the sacred army, she willed that we should duly profess: "The Lord is the portion of my inheritance and of my cup: it is thou that wilt restore my inheritance to me" (Ps. xv., 5). By which words, says Jerome, "the cleric" is admonished "that as he is the portion of the Lord and has the Lord for his portion, so he should show himself as possessing the Lord and being possessed by the Lord" (Ep. lii., and *Nepotianum*). How solemnly she addresses those about to be numbered among the sub-deacons! "Again and again you should consider attentively what a great burden is that you further desire to-day . . . but if you take this order, it will be no longer lawful for you to withdraw from your determination . . . but you must serve God perpetually and with the help of His grace observe chastity." And, finally: "If hitherto you have been remiss at church, now you must be assiduous; if hitherto somnolent, now vigilant; if hitherto unclean, now chaste. . . . Remember whose ministry it is that is given to you." For those about to be advanced to the diaconate the Bishop beseeches from God: "That all virtue may abound in them, modest authority, constant modesty, the purity of innocence and the observance of spiritual discipline. Let Thy precepts shine forth in their conduct, that the people may acquire holy imitation from the example of their chastity." But far more severe is the admonition addressed to those about to be initiated in the priesthood: "With great fear is such a step to be made, and care is to be taken that heavenly wisdom, upright conduct and long observance of justice commend those who are chosen to make it. . . . Let the odor of your life be the delight of the Church of Christ, that by your preaching and example you may build up the house—that is, the family of God." And most impressive of all is that most solemn

addition: "Imitate the things wherewith you treat," which agrees perfectly with the precept of Paul: "That we may present every man perfect in Jesus Christ" (Col. i., 28).

Such being the mind of the Church on the life of priests, nobody will be surprised to find that all the Holy Fathers and doctors with one accord speak on this subject in a manner that might to some appear to be extreme; but if we weigh their words carefully, we shall find that what they teach is most true and right. Their opinion may be summed up thus: Between the priest and any upright man there should be as much difference as there is between heaven and earth, and for this same reason priestly virtue must shun not only graver sins, but even the slightest. The Council of Trent held by the judgment of those venerable men when it admonished clerics to avoid "even light faults as being in them most serious" (Sess. XXII., de reform., c. I.); most serious, that is, not in themselves, but by reason of the person who commits them, of whom with better right than of material temples it may be said: "Holiness becomes Thy house" (Ps. xcii., 5).

And now let us see in what consists this sanctity which should not be lacking in the priest, for if a man is ignorant of this or misunderstands it he is certainly in great danger. For there are those who think, nay, proclaim aloud, that the merit of a priest should consist in the fact that he is entirely occupied in working for others, so that paying but little heed to the virtues by which a man is perfected himself (and which they thus call "passive" virtues) they proclaim that all a man's strength and zeal should be put forth in fostering and exercising the "active" virtues. This teaching is utterly fallacious and destructive, and concerning it our predecessor of happy memory in his wisdom thus pronounced concerning it (Testem benevolentiae, ad episc. Baltimor., 22 Jan., 1899): "That some of the Christian virtues were meant for other times can only be held by one who fails to remember the words of the apostle: 'Whom he foreknew he also made destined to be conformable to the image of His Son.' The teacher and exemplar of all sanctity is Christ, and upon His rule are to be modeled all who wish to have a place among the blessed. Now, Christ does not change with the progress of ages, but 'is the same' yesterday, to-day and forever (Hebr. xiii., 8). To men of all times, therefore, are applicable the words: 'Learn of me, for I am meek and humble of heart' (Matth. xi., 29); and there is no time when Christ does not show Himself forth to us 'having become obedient unto death' (Phill. ii., 8); and to every age belongs the sentence of the apostle: 'They who are of Christ have crucified their flesh, with its vices and concupiscences' (Gal. v., 24)." And these quotations, while applying to every one

of the faithful, refer more specially to priests, who should also, above others, take to themselves what our predecessor, with apostolic zeal, proceeds to add: "Would that these virtues were now practiced by many more in our times as they were practiced by those most holy men of former ages, who in their humility, obedience and abstinence were 'powerful in their works and words,' to the great advantage not only of religion, but of civil society." Here it is well to observe that the most prudent Pontiff rightly makes special mention of abstinence, which, in the language of the Gospel, we call self-denial. Truly, beloved sons, under this head is contained the strength and virtue and all the fruit of the sacerdotal office: this neglected, the way is opened for everything that is capable of offending the eyes and souls of the people in the life of a priest. For if a man works for filthy lucre, if he mixes himself with the affairs of the world, if he seeks after the first places and despises the others, if he yields to flesh and blood, if he strives to please men, if he puts his trust in the plausible words of human wisdom—all this happens because he neglects the commandment of Christ and rejects the condition laid down by Him: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself" (Matth. xv., 24).

But while we inculcate this truth, we none the less admonish the priest that not for himself alone is he to live a holy life, for he is the "workman whom Christ went out to bring into His vineyard" (Matth. xx., 1). It is for him, therefore, to pluck up fallacious plants, to sow useful ones, to water the ground, to watch lest the enemy sow tares. Hence the priest must take care not to be led by a species of misguided zeal for his own private perfection to omit any part of his office for the good of others, such as preaching the word of God, hearing confessions properly, assisting the sick, especially when they are near death; instructing those who are ignorant of their faith, consoling those in affliction, bringing back the erring, in all things imitating Christ, "who went about doing good and healing all oppressed by the devil" (Acts x., 38). But let that important warning of the apostle be carefully remembered: "Neither he that planteth is anything nor he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase" (I. Cor. iii., 7). For men may go forth weeping and sowing their seed, and they may till it with much labor, but it belongs to God and to His most powerful help to make the seed germinate and bring forth the desired fruit. Besides, it must always be borne in mind that men are but as instruments which God utilizes for the salvation of souls, and that it is required of them that they should be fit to be handled by God. Wherefore? Do we think that God is moved by any natural or acquired excellence of ours to use our assistance for the increase of His glory?

By no means, for it is written: "The foolish things of the world hath God chosen that He may confound the wise; and the weak things of the world hath God chosen that He may confound the strong; and the base things of the world and the things that are contemptible and things that are not hath God chosen, that He might bring to naught things that are" (I. Cor. i., 27, 28). One thing alone joins man with God, makes him pleasing and a not unworthy minister of His mercy: holiness of life and conduct. The priest who lacks this, the supereminent knowledge of Christ, lacks all. For disjoined from this, even the abundance of acquired knowledge (which we ourself are seeking to promote among the clergy) and skill and quickness in acting, although they may prove of some profit to the Church and to individuals, are not unfrequently a lamentable cause of loss to them. But how much can be attempted and accomplished by the man, however lowly, who is adorned with and rich in sanctity is shown by numerous examples in all ages, and very brilliantly by one of recent date, that model pastor of souls, John Baptist Vianney, to whom we rejoice to have decreed the honors of the blessed in heaven. Sanctity alone makes us what our divine vocation requires us to be: men crucified to the world, and for whom the world itself is crucified; men walking in newness of life, who, as Paul admonishes, should show themselves as the ministers of God "in labors, in watchings, in fastings, in chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned, in the word of truth" (II. Cor. vi., 5 foll.); whose thoughts are fixed only on heavenly things, and who strive by all means to lead others thither.

But since, as all are aware, sanctity of life is the fruit of our will, only in as far as our will is strengthened by Divine grace, God Himself makes abundant provision that we may never, if we so wish, be destitute of grace, and this we acquire chiefly by the practice of prayer. Truly between prayer and sanctity the connection is so close that one cannot exist without the other, and Chrysostom was quite in the truth when he said: "I think it must be plain to all that it is simply impossible to live virtuously without the help of prayer" (*De precatone*, orat. I.), while Augustine acutely concludes that "he truly knows how to live rightly who knows how to pray rightly" (*Hom.*, IV. ex 50). But Christ Himself brings home to us still more forcibly, by His frequent exhortations, and most of all by His example, the force of these quotations. For in order to pray He was wont to retire into desert places or to go up in the mountains alone. He used to spend whole nights in prayer. He frequently went into the temple; nay, even when the crowds pressed around Him, He used to pray openly with His eyes raised to

heaven. And at the end, when nailed to the cross, amid the pains of death, He implored the Father with a loud cry and with tears. Let us have it for certain, therefore, that a priest, to fulfill worthily his dignity and his office, must be given in a marked way to the practice of prayer. Too often it is to be lamented that he applies himself to it rather from custom than from devotion when he recites the psalms negligently or hurries through a few prayers at stated hours and for the rest of the day never thinks of addressing God or piously turning his mind upwards. Yet the priest should obey much more diligently than others the command of Christ: "We ought always to pray" (Luke xvii., 1), and hence Paul was so earnest in urging: "Be instant in prayer, watching in it in thanksgiving" (Coloss. iv., 2). "Pray without ceasing" (I. Thess. v., 17). For the soul that is desirous of its own sanctity, as well as of the salvation of others, how many occasions are given every day for turning to God! Inward troubles, the strength and obstinacy of temptations, lack of virtues, remissness in labor and the sterility of it, most frequent offenses and negligences, the fear of the divine judgments—all these are powerful incentives to us to cry out before the Lord and thus, in addition to receiving the aid we seek, to become easily rich in merits. Nor is it for ourselves alone that we should weep. Amid the deluge of iniquity which is spreading on all sides, it is for us especially to implore and beseech the Divine mercy, for us to entreat Christ, so benignly lavish of all grace in the wonderful sacrament: "Spare, O Lord, spare Thy people."

On this head it is of the first importance that a certain time should be allotted every day for meditation on the things of eternity. No priest can omit this without being guilty of serious negligence and to the detriment of his soul. Writing to Eugene III., formerly his pupil, but at the time Roman Pontiff, the most holy Abbot Bernard frankly and urgently admonished him never to omit his daily meditation on divine things, on any pretext of the great and many cares that accompany the supreme apostolate. He contended that he was justified in this, thus enumerating most prudently the advantages of the practice: "Meditation purifies the source—that is, the mind—from which it springs. Then it governs the affections, directs the acts, corrects the excesses, regulates the conduct, brings purity and order into the life of him who practices it; finally it confers knowledge both of human and divine things. Meditation separates what is confused, brings together what is divided, collects what is scattered, reveals what is hidden, investigates what is the truth, examines what is probable, discovers what is false and fictitious. Meditation ordains what is to be done, reflects on what has been performed, so that nothing remains in the mind either incor-

rect or needing to be corrected. In prosperity it has the sense of coming adversity; when adversity comes, it comes unfelt; and of these, the latter is the fruit of fortitude, the former of prudence."

This summary of the advantages which meditation is designed to secure for us also teaches and admonishes us not only how salutary it is in every way, but how very necessary.

For august and venerable as are the various offices of the priesthood, it happens that those who have to perform them frequently and familiarly come to treat them in a way not consonant with their dignity. Hence the soul gradually losing its fervor, the way to carelessness is made easy, with consequent distaste for the most sacred things. Then, again, the priest is obliged to be in daily intercourse, as it were, "in the midst of a wicked people," so that frequently even in the very performance of his work of pastoral charity he has reason to fear the secret wiles of the serpent. And are not even religious hearts prone to be soiled by the dust of the world? It is apparent, then, that there exists a great and urgent necessity to return daily to the contemplation of eternity, that the mind and the will, deriving fresh strength therefrom, may be fortified against the allurements of the world. Moreover, it behoves a priest to be possessed of a certain facility of rising to and dwelling on heavenly things, for it is his duty to relish, to declare, to persuade heavenly things, and to so order his life above human affairs that whatever he does in the fulfillment of his sacred office he may do it according to God under the instinct and the guidance of faith. Now, this habit of mind and this, as it were, native union with God is greatly furthered and protected by the practice of daily meditation—a truth which must be so plain to every thoughtful man that it is unnecessary to dwell longer on it.

A confirmation, albeit a painful one, of all this is to be found in the lives of those priests who make light of meditation on divine things, or have open antipathy for it. See those men in whom "the sense of Christ," that most estimable gift, languishes, entirely occupied with earthly things, following vanity, babbling of trifles, performing their sacred duties negligently, coldly, perhaps even unworthily! Once, while the gift of the sacerdotal unction was fresh upon them, they used to prepare their souls diligently for the psaltery, to seek out the most favorable time and place, far from the din of the world, to endeavor to penetrate the sense of the divine words, to praise and weep and exult, to pour out their spirit with the psalmist. But now how changed are they from of old! And thus hardly anything is left in them of their former ardent devotion towards the divine mysteries. How pleasant were those tabernacles in the days gone by! How the heart rejoiced to be

present in the circle of the table of the Lord, and to call others and still others thither! What purity before the sacrifice, what prayers issued forth from the desiring soul! And during its progress how great was the reverence, how perfectly the august ceremonies were performed in all their beauty! What heartfelt thanksgiving, and how happily the good odor of Christ went out among the people! "Call to mind," we beseech you, beloved sons, "call to mind the former days," for then the soul was aglow, when it fed on holy meditation.

Among those who are loath or who neglect "to consider in their hearts" (Jer. xii., 11) there are some who do not hide their consequent poverty of soul, but rather excuse it on the plea that they are entirely given up to the bustle of ministerial life for the manifold utility of others. But they are miserably deluded. For when priests not accustomed to converse with God speak of Him to others, or give counsel on the Christian life, they are utterly destitute of the divine impulse, and their preaching of the Gospel seems to be, as it were, half dead. Their voice, be it ever so rich in prudence and eloquence, bears no resemblance to the voice of the Good Shepherd, which the sheep listen to for their salvation. It makes a noise and flows away emptily, and sometimes it is fruitful in bad example, to the shame of religion and the offense of the good. So is it also with the other parts of the busy life, they are either altogether without result or the results are fleeting through lack of that heavenly dew which "the prayer of him that humbleth himself" (Eccl. xxxv., 2) calls forth so abundantly. And here we cannot but bitterly lament the conduct of those who, taken up with pestiferous novelties, are not afraid to contradict all this, and who consider the time spent in meditation and prayer as lost! O fatal blindness! Would that such considered the subject rightly within themselves and recognized at last how this neglect of and contempt for prayer ends! From it have sprung pride and contumacy, producing those bitter fruits which our paternal heart recoils to think of and ardently wishes to see wither away. May God grant the wish, and looking down in His kindness on the erring, pour out upon them "the spirit of grace and of prayer" in such abundance that they may bewail their errors, and, to the joy of all, return to the paths they have so unfortunately abandoned, and for the future walk in them with more circumspection. And so may God be our witness, as of old for the apostle, how we "long after them all in the bowels of Jesus Christ" (Phill. i., 8).

For them and for all of you, beloved sons, let this exhortation of ours, which is that of Christ the Lord, take deep root: "Take ye heed, watch and pray" (Mark xiii., 33). But especially in the

practice of pious meditation let the efforts of all be engaged, let the soul win confidence from frequent repetition of the words, "Lord, teach us how to pray" (Luke xi., 1). There is one special reason which should have much weight in urging us to practice meditation—the wealth of counsel and virtue derived therefrom for that most difficult of all tasks, the proper care of souls. St. Charles in one of his pastorals dwells on this in a manner worthy of being remembered: "Understand, brethren, that nothing is so necessary for all ecclesiastics as mental prayer, preceeding, accompanying and following all our actions. 'I will sing and I will understand,' says the Prophet (Ps. c., 2). If you administer the sacrament, O brother, meditate on what you are doing; if you celebrate Mass, meditate on what you are offering; if you are reciting the psalms, meditate to whom and what you are speaking; if you are engaged in the care of souls, meditate by whose blood they have been washed." (Ex oration, ad clerum.) Hence it is that the Church rightly and justly commands us to repeat frequently those words of David: "Blessed is the man who meditates on the law of the Lord; his will shall remain by night and by day; all things that he shall do shall prosper." Finally there remains one noble incentive worth all the others. For if the priest is called *Another Christ*, and is so by reason of the communication of authority, should he not entirely become so, and be held as such, also by reason of his imitation of the actions of Christ? "Let our chief care, therefore, be to meditate on the life of Christ" (Imitation i., 1).

With the daily contemplation of divine things it is of great importance that the priest should unite the assiduous reading of pious books, especially those that are divinely inspired. Thus Paul commanded Timothy: "Attend unto reading" (I. Tim. iv., 13). So also Jerome, training Nepotian in the priestly life, inculcated: "Let sacred reading be never out of your hands," and he proceeds to give a reason for his advice: "Learn yourself what you are to teach, attain that faithful speech which is according to knowledge, that you may be able to exhort in sound teaching, and put to silence those that contradict" (Ep. lviii. ad Paulinum, no. 6). What great profit from this exercise for the priests who practice it constantly, how full of savour is their preaching of Christ, and how forcibly the minds and hearts of their hearers, instead of being smoothed and petted, are drawn to better things and raised to heavenly desires! But for another reason, and one, beloved sons, greatly profitable to you, should the counsel of Jerome be taken to heart: "Let sacred reading be never out of your hands" (Ep. ad Paulinum, no. 6). For who does not know of the great influence exercised over the mind of a friend by a friend who candidly warns him, helps him with advice,

rebukes, stimulates, leads him back from error? "Blessed is he who finds a true friend" (Eccli. xxv., 12); "he who finds him finds a treasure" (Ib., vi., 14). Now pious books we must count as truly faithful friends.

For they solemnly warn us of our duties and of the precepts of lawful discipline; they awake in our souls the heavenly voices that have been silenced; they disturb the treacherous calm in which we live; they charge us with those inclinations which contain concealed snares; they reveal the dangers that so often lie in the path of the unwary. And all this they do with such silent kindness that they show themselves not only to be our friends, but our very best friends. Thus we have always, whenever we like, at our very side friends ever ready to help us in our most secret necessities, friends whose voice is never harsh, whose counsel is never dictated by cupidity, whose speech is never timid or false. There are many striking examples to show the salutary efficacy of pious books, but on that stands out beyond all others is that of Augustine, whose immense services to the Church dated their origin from it: "Take and read, take and read. . . . I took up [the Epistle of Paul] and read in silence . . . (Luke xvi., 8). As though the light of certainty were infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt disappeared" (Conf. i., viii., c. 12). But too often alas! in our days the contrary happens, and ecclesiastics are gradually plunged in the darkness of doubt, and led to follow the crooked paths of the age, chiefly because to pious and divine books they far prefer others of all kinds and a host of periodicals, that bring seductive error and pestilence in their train. Be on your guard, beloved sons; rely not on the fact that you have reached years of maturity or even advanced age, and be not deluded by the treacherous hope that by reading these you will be in a better position to provide for the common welfare. Certain limits are to be observed, those prescribed by the laws of the Church and those which prudence and charity for one's self point out; for when a man once takes these poisons into his heart, very rarely does he escape the evil consequences.

The profit accruing to the priest both from devout reading and from meditation on heavenly things will be more abundant if he takes steps to discover whether he religiously studies to turn to practical account in his life what he has read and meditated. Chrysostom has a passage, especially adapted for priests, which is directly to the point: "Every day at nightfall, before sleep comes upon you, 'excite the judgment of your conscience, demand an account from it, and whatever evil counsels you may have taken during the day . . . dig them up and root them out, and take upon yourself the penalty for them'" (Exposit. in Ps. iv., n. 8).

How true this is, and how fruitful for Christian virtue, is shown by the excellent admonitions and exhortations of the most prudent masters of the spiritual life. There is a striking passage in the discipline of St. Bernard well worth remembering: "Be a careful examiner of your integrity, search out your own life in daily discussion with yourself. Watch diligently how much progress you make, or how much you have gone back. . . . Strive to know yourself. . . . Put all your transgressions before your own eyes. . . . Set yourself before yourself as before another, and so weep for yourself" (*Meditationes piissimae*, c. v., de quotid. sui ipsius exam.).

It is truly shameful if the words of Christ find their application here also: "The children of the world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." We see with what attention they look after their business; how frequently they go over the accounts of their expenditure and receipts; how accurately and closely they make up their accounts; how they bewail their losses and how eagerly they strive to make them good. But we, with our mind perhaps bent on securing honors, on increasing our substance, on winning only applause and honor by our knowledge, become tired or annoyed in treating of what is our main concern, and that a most arduous one, viz., the acquiring of holiness. For but rarely do we collect ourselves to explore our hearts, which thus become overgrown with weeds as was the case of the lazy man's vineyard of which it was written: "I passed by the field of the slothful man, and by the vineyard of the foolish man; and behold it was all filled with nettles, and thorns had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall was broken down" (*Pro.* xxiv., 30, 31). And the necessity of walking every day with greater caution and of making more strenuous efforts is increased by the many bad examples which we see around us and which are so deadly even for priestly virtue. Now experience teaches that the man who exercises a frequent and rigid censorship over his thoughts, words and actions is the better capable at once of hating and avoiding evil and of cultivating earnestly what is good. Experience equally teaches us how many drawbacks and losses fall to the lot of the man who shuns that tribunal where justice sits in judgment, and his conscience appears as the culprit and as his accuser. In such a man you will in vain look for that circumspection of conduct, so highly praiseworthy in the Christian, which seeks to avoid even minor faults, that modesty of soul, so becoming to the priest, which trembles before every offense, even the slightest, against God. Nay, it sometimes happens even that this carelessness and negligence of himself reaches the point when he neglects the very sacrament of penance, than which Christ in His great mercy has left no more suitable remedy for human weakness. It cannot be

denied, but it is to be bitterly deplored, that not unfrequently the man who deters others from sin by the fulminations of his sacred oratory, has no fear for himself and allows himself to become hardened in his own sins; that he who exhorts and incites others not to delay in cleansing themselves duly of their stains, is himself so slothful and delays long months to do the same; that he who pours the oil and wine of salvation into the wounds of others, lies himself wounded by the wayside, taking no thought to secure for himself the healing hand of a brother, and that so very near to him. Alas, how much has happened everywhere in the past and how much is happening to-day absolutely unworthy in the sight of God and the Church, pernicious to the Christian people, and shameful for the priestly order!

When the duty of our office obliges us to think on all this, beloved sons, our heart is filled with grief, and we groan aloud: Woe to the priest who does not know how to keep his place, and who unfaithfully pollutes the name of the holy God for whom he should be holy! The corruption of the best is most dreadful: "Great is the dignity of priests, but great is their ruin if they sin; let us rejoice in the height upon which we stand, but let us fear the depths to which we may fall; the joy of having held loftiest places is not so great as the grief of having fallen headlong into the abyss" (S. Hieron., in Ezech., l. xiii., c. 44, v. 30). Woe then to the priest who, unmindful of himself, abandons the practice of prayer, who rejects the nourishment of spiritual reading, who never turns back to himself to listen to the voice of his accusing conscience! Neither the bleeding wounds of his own soul nor the lamentations of his Mother Church shall rouse the wretched man until those terrible threats strike him: "Blind the heart of this people, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and be converted and I heal them" (Is. vi., 10). May God, rich in mercy, avert from every one of you, beloved sons, this terrible omen. He who sees our heart knows that there is in it no bitterness against anybody, but that it is stirred with all the charity of a pastor and a father for all: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of glory? Are not you in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ?"

But you see, all of you in all parts of the world, on what times the Church, in the hidden designs of God, has fallen. See also, then, and meditate how holy is the office you hold, that you may strive to be of help and assistance in her trials to her from whom you have received the great dignity with which you are endowed. Now, if never before, therefore, it is necessary that the clergy should be filled with no ordinary virtue, sound in example, watchful, active,

thoroughly ready to work for Christ and to withstand the strongest attacks. For nothing else do we pray and yearn more ardently than that this may be realized in you, one and all. Let chastity, therefore, ever flourish among you in unblemished honor, that choicest ornament of our order, in whose beauty as the priest is made like to the angels so is he, too, more venerable in the eyes of the Christian people, and richer in holy fruits. Let the reverence and obedience solemnly promised to those whom the Holy Ghost has placed as rulers of the Church ever flourish and increase, and especially let your minds and hearts be drawn daily in closer bonds of fidelity in the obedience most justly due to this apostolic see. Let charity, that never seeketh its own, shine forth in all, so that the goads of envy and ambition may be restrained and all your efforts unite in friendly emulation for the increase of God's glory.

The fruits of your charity are waited for by a *great multitude of the sick, the blind, the lame, the withered*, all in the direst misery, but most of all by dense throngs of youths, the fairest hope of the State and of religion, who are now surrounded on every side by fallacies and corruption. Be diligent not only in catechetical instruction, which we commend once more and most earnestly, but by every means and with all the skill of which you are capable, strive to deserve well of all. By elevating, protecting, healing, pacifying, set your hearts and your desires on winning or binding souls to Christ. How tirelessly, alas! and how laboriously and fearlessly His enemies are acting and pressing on, to the immense ruin of souls! The Catholic Church rejoices and glories greatly in the charitable zeal of her clergy in preaching the Gospel of Christian peace, in bringing salvation and civilization even to barbarous nations, and thus by their labors, often consecrated by the shedding of their blood, the kingdom of Christ is being daily propagated and our holy faith is winning new laurels and still greater lustre. And if your charitable offices, beloved sons, meet with insults, abuse, calumny, as only too frequently is the case, do not therefore give way to sadness, "be not weary in well-doing" (II. Thess. iii., 13). Keep before your eyes that host of great men who, following the example of the Apostles, in the midst of bitterest contumely borne for the name of Christ, "went rejoicing, blessing when they were cursed." For we are the sons of the saints whose names are resplendent in the book of life, whose praises the Church proclaims: "Let us not stain our glory" (I. Macc. ix., 10).

Once we have restored and increased the spirit of sacerdotal grace among all orders of the clergy, our designs, under the Divine guidance, for the restoration of all else, will acquire far more efficacy. Wherefore in addition to what we have already set forth, we deem

it well to add certain subsidiary and appropriate means for preserving and fostering grace in the clergy. And first of these, a means known to and approved by all but not by all sufficiently tried, comes the devout retreat of the soul in what are known as spiritual exercises, yearly when this is possible, and either separately, or rather in union with others, for in this manner more fruit is usually obtained—but always according to the prescriptions of the Bishops. The advantages of this practice we ourself have sufficiently praised in laying down certain rules regarding discipline for the Roman clergy (Ep. "Experiendo" ad Card. in Urbe Vicarium, 27 Dec., 1904).

Not less profitable, too, are short retreats for a few hours every month, either privately or in common, a custom which we are glad to see has been introduced in various places, with the favor of the Bishops who sometimes preside themselves over such gatherings.

Again we heartily commend a certain closer union of priests among themselves, as becomes brothers, under the sanction and the rule of the Bishop. It is certainly profitable that they should unite to render mutual assistance to one another in adversity, to protect the honor of their name and office against attack, and for other similar reasons. But it is far more important that they should join together for the purpose of promoting sacred knowledge, and first of all for maintaining with greater earnestness the holy purpose of their vocation, for consulting the interests of souls, by combining their counsels and their strength. The annals of the Church bear witness to the excellent fruit derived from this kind of communion in the days when priests generally lived in a sense in common. Why should not something of the kind be revived in our time, as far as may be done with due regard to different places and offices? Is there not good reason to hope that the former fruits would thus be produced again, to the joy of the Church? Indeed, there are already in existence a number of such societies, with the approval of the Bishops, and they are all the more useful when priests enter them early, at the very beginning of their priesthood. We ourself during our episcopate favored one which we found to be very suitable, and even now we continue to favor it, and others, in a special way. These aids to sacerdotal grace and those others which the watchful prudence of the Bishops may suggest as occasion serves, do you, beloved sons, so value and so employ, that every day more and more "you may walk worthy of the vocation in which you have been called" (Eph. iv., 1) honoring your ministry, and perfecting in you the will of God which is your sanctification.

Such are our chief thoughts and anxieties; wherefore, raising our eyes up to heaven, with the voice of Christ the Lord we suppliantly

and frequently repeat on behalf of all the clergy: "Holy Father . . . sanctify them" (John xvii., ii., 17). We rejoice that in this holy aim great numbers of all ranks of the faithful are praying with us, deeply solicitous for your common good and that of the Church; nay more, that there are generous souls not a few, nor confined to those dedicated to religion but living in the midst of the world, who freely offer themselves as victims to God for the same purpose. May God Almighty receive their pure and powerful prayers in the odor of sweetness, nor despise our own most humble prayers. May He in His mercy and providence vouchsafe to hear us, we earnestly pray, and from the most sacred Heart of His Beloved Son pour out on all the clergy the treasures of grace, charity and all virtue. Finally, beloved sons, we heartily thank you for the good wishes you have offered us so abundantly on the approach of the fiftieth anniversary of our priesthood, and that our good wishes for you in return may be fulfilled over and over we put them in the hands of the great Virgin Mother, Queen of Apostles. For she it was who by her example taught those first fruits of the sacred order how they should persevere unanimously in prayer till they were clothed with virtue from above, and that this same virtue in them might be made greatly more abundant she obtained by her prayers, she increased and strengthened by her counsel for the rich fertility of their labors. Meanwhile, beloved sons, we earnestly hope that the peace of Christ may exult in your hearts with the joy of the Holy Ghost, through the Apostolic Benediction which we impart to you all most lovingly.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the fourth day of August in the year MCMVIII., beginning the sixth year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

MEDIÆVAL THEOLOGY:¹ A FEW NOTES ON ITS EARLY HISTORY.

EVERY period of transition claims from more than one point of view the attention of the historian, and no more than any other field of human knoweldge does theology make an exception to this rule. In this respect the long interval that separates the Carlovingian renaissance from the intellectual development of the twelfth century presents us with a line of study at once profitable and satisfactory. The effort, it is true, which it requires to trace back the various remnants left by the systems and writers of these long centuries may seem rather hard and wearisome, but this labor cannot fail to be rewarded for all its minuteness and details by the additional light it will throw on the movement as a whole. Here, indeed, all the different by-paths lead up to one centre that will soon appear in open view. Looked at from this standpoint, even the dark tenth century, that century of iron and lead, as Baronius called it, presents itself in a quite different light. Without going so far in our admiration as to adopt the exaggerated views of Leibnitz, who placed it before the thirteenth century, we cannot help taking an interest in it and studying it with pleasure. The reason of this is that, though fragmentary, imperfect and capricious, as the writings of this transition period appear at first sight, yet they play in the history of theology a part whose importance is far more

¹ The writer of this article, to avoid making it unnecessarily long, and to avoid encumbering the pages with a multitude of footnotes, has constrained himself not to make use of references. He intends on another occasion to adduce his facts and arguments in favor of the opinions here defended. Among the works, either general or particular, published on this matter, or on connected questions; he makes a point of naming those to whom he is in particular indebted for opinions or facts found in these pages, or which may provide the reader with additional information. Such are the well-known books of Bardenhewer, Harnack, Loofs, Schwane, Seeburg, on patrilology and history of dogma; Krumbacher-Ehrhard, "Gesch. der byzant. Litteratur," München, 1897; De Wulf, "Histoire de la philosophie médiévale," Louvain, 1905; Hauck, "Kichengeschichte Deutschlands," Leipzig, 1896, etc.; Ueberweg-Heinze, "Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos.," II. Berlin, 1905; Prantl, "Geschichte der Logik in Abendlande," II. Leipzig, 1885; Norden, "Antike Kunstproza," II. Leipzig, 1898; Mariétan, "Le problème de la classification des sciences d'Aristote à S. Thomas," Paris, 1901; Meyer, "Die sieben freien Künste im Mittelalter," Einsiedeln, 1886-1887; Roger, "L'Enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin," Paris, 1905. The well-known books or articles of Maassen, v. Schulte, P. Fournier, on the history of canonical litterature; Saltet, "Les Réordinations," Paris, 1906; Sandys, "A History of Classical Scholarship," Cambridge, 1906, second edition; several articles of J. Endres in the "Philosophisches Jahrbuch," "Hist. Jahrbuch," etc., on early medieval philosophy, and some articles of encyclopedical works on theology ("Dictionnaire de Vacant-Mangenot," Hauck's "Real-Encyclopädie"), etc.

extended than we might feel inclined to suppose, considering the dusty corners that are often assigned to them in our libraries and manuscript collections. Compilations badly put together, in an unpolished and unoriginal fashion, collections less awkward in appearance and sparkling here and there with a thought not too unoriginal, selections dignified with the title of "Flores, Flosculi, Deflorationes, Liber Floridus" or "Scintillae," monographs sometimes carried to a certain point of finish, but often hopelessly superficial, treatises too formal in character or full of digressions, attempts at an explanation by the light of reason, outlines of methods or programmes of questions, the various items pertaining to theology classified in alphabetical order, such is the legacy left us by the tenth, eleventh and especially the twelfth century, and presenting us with the spectacle of the first manifestations of an intellectual life whose after development promises to be vigorous and intense. It is in this fact that lies the greater part of their interest and value; they constitute the "Vorgeschichte" of the theological construction of the thirteenth century. Hence it is any one who wishes to thoroughly understand the intellectual trend of this synthetical movement will easily be convinced of the utility of a simultaneous study of the transition period with which the thirteenth century is so intimately bound up. The omission of this study would not be without its effects even for the history of dogma itself. For though the greater part of the writings and controversies that sprung up at this period belong to the domain of dogmatics rather than to that of dogma, yet it cannot be denied, however little we may follow in their details the vicissitudes of this period, that in them is to be found the groundwork of the synthesis that followed and the first outlines of the formulas which opened the way to the definitions of the Council of Trent.

Such are the advantages which the study of this suggestive and eventful period may secure. Nor are they the only ones; our labor will also be rewarded by the attraction of many disconcerting contrasts or similitudes that we find strewn along the pathway of the literature of this time, and by the fascinating interest which arises from several enigmatical and unexpected antitheses, the expression of which might cause a reader overprejudiced or biased by the opinions of later times to see nothing but paradoxal sayings.

To attempt to compress within the compass of a few pages the building up of theology during this period would be an undertaking doomed to failure from the outset. He at least who has undertaken to explore the vast region that the literature of these centuries opens up, or who has seen what a world of labor must be gone through to prepare the way for afterwork, will understand how rash and

presumptuous such an undertaking would be. Such is the amount of inextricable questions as to authenticity, sources, chronology, etc., which are connected with each name that it defies, and will do so for a long time to come, every attempt of such a nature. We will be content then with selecting some of the characteristics of this period and grouping them together in one point of view to present our readers with a simple review, an inventory as it were, of what may be looked upon as more or less "acquired," leaving to other works the task of completing or correcting when necessary. We venture to think that our humble *résumé* will not be without its utility; no science whatever can fail to turn to profitable account a backward glance, however rapid and incomplete it may be, upon its past history. Is it not thus that its methods are improved, its results classified and that both the one and the other, studied in the light of their origins, point the way to new and more important conquests?

At the close of these three or four centuries devoted to a painful theological effort came out, towards the year 1150, a work which we are forced to hail as the converging point of all preceding labors as well as the point of departure of those that are destined to follow. The work to which we refer is the "*Liber Sententiarum*" of Peter Lombard (†1160), which sprung from a long line of intellectual ancestors and was ranked by the verdict of succeeding times as high—even higher, according to Roger Bacon—as the Bible itself in theological teaching. Owing to the elaboration of the different factors that opened the way for it, it can be said to have grown out of the Carolingian schools. By the rudimentary programme of knowledge that builds up its previous history we are allowed to search for its early models and sketches in the reform legislation of the ninth and tenth century, and by the materials it puts together it may be traced back at least indirectly through some well-known channels to the patristic period. On the other hand, owing to its widespread diffusion throughout the whole of Christendom and owing also to the numerous commentaries on its text—some even in verse—in use in the different universities during more than three centuries and a half, it has enjoyed in the history of dogmatics or even, as we think, in that of dogma, a by no means inconsiderable place. The extraordinary number of manuscripts that contain its text is alone a sufficient support of the view we are expressing here regarding the far-reaching importance of the work.

It is, then, on the book of the "*Magister Sententiarum*" and on the literary circumstances that led up to it that we will concentrate our attention in the following pages of our sketch. The period that this work brings to an end might be called "the history of its elaboration." From this point of view we will undertake to present

in their relation to Lombard's works the considerations upon the teaching of the schools, doctrinal controversy, canonical matters and events of an internal or external order, into all of which we must necessarily indulge at some length.

The patristic period, once arrived at the zenith of its fame, did not long enjoy the triumph of its fruitful activity. Already on the morrow of the death of Augustin (†430) or Cyril of Alexandria (†444) we see signs of a decay springing up which the political and social upheavals caused by the German invasions were destined to hasten, especially in the West. Literary activity, even in the case of writers of mark, either of Roman or Germanic origin, expended itself on works of an encyclopædic or compilatory character. For instance, side by side with Cassidor (†575) and Boethius (†525) himself we find Isidor of Seville (†636), Gregory the Great (†604) and, later on, Julian of Toledo (†690) and Venerable Bede (†735), not to speak of mere copyists or extract fabricators.

In the East this taste for compilation was stimulated by an unconquerable fear of all that was not copy or repetition. The result was that collections with series of texts hardly to be called "Flowers" multiplied, which history catalogues as "Florilegia." Each fresh discussion—and how many have Byzantine monasteries not witnessed—was the signal for an abundance of literature of this sort on both sides when the parties had no recourse to less pacific arguments. The profane literature of the period did not escape the prevailing fashion of *résumé* and reproduction. When human thought contents itself with living only the life of past generations we have but to draw up the catalogue of their writings and make out the list of their ideas; in that consists their whole literature. Alexandria had done so formerly and, indeed, with such a wealth of erudition as to call forth our admiration even to-day. In the seventh century Byzantium renewed this phase of literary history, and in a more rudimentary shape the whole activity of the West was concentrated in it for a considerable time. To this movement in the East we owe the systematic exposition of S. John Damascène (†754), the S. Thomas of the East, which appeared towards the middle of the eighth century, a huge compilation, giving a codification of doctrine from which all originality is banished, according to the author himself, "Ero taiparou emon ouden." Owing to a translation which came out about the year 1150 from the pen of a Pisan citizen delegated to Constantinople, Peter the Lombard was enabled to utilize the book, and even perhaps to draw on it for the plan of his work. On the other hand, however, it seems to have henceforward discouraged the Greeks from similar efforts by the many evident good qualities that it displayed.

A less prompt, but more uninterrupted and unquestionably more brilliant career opened for the West. After the first period of its theological activity, which closed on the appearance of the "*Liber Sententiarum*," four centuries after the Damascène, another period began, one of conspicuous splendor, that of S. Thomas Aquinas. There is no need to ask which of the two, the prince of theology in the West, or John Damascène, is the more exalted by the union of the names of S. Thomas and of the Doctor of Damascus.

The first outlines of the theological systematization brought about by the book of Sentences of Peter are to be looked for, as we have said, in the schools of preceding ages. Underlying this theology we find everywhere the civilizing influence of Charlemagne (†814), an influence fertile, indeed, for the ensuing ages, in spite of the blight that seems to fall on it before the fourth generation had passed away. We do not, however, mean to insinuate by this that the theology of the Middle Ages sprang in all its fullness from the Carlovingian schools in the same manner as it later went out from the cloisters of Notre Dame of Paris and made its way to the very confines of the Christian world. But for the first seeds whence sprang its elements and for the spirit that gave it life we must look to the schools of other institutions, liturgical, pastoral, etc., that owed their existence to the indefatigable legislation of the great Emperor. This is only one of the many ways in which the intellectual movement of the eighth and ninth centuries may not be looked upon as a mere appendix of the past; for, even in its theology, may be discerned more than one hint which points to the future, as is fully evidenced by the fact that it gives a notable impulse to what were later the chief features of the system to become classic, acuteness in dialectics and respect for the materials left by tradition. The schools provide us mainly with the former; for the second we are much indebted to the other Carlovingian institutions. It will be well to halt for a moment to consider the period under this aspect.

To this early stage, in which are to be found not merely the primary materials, but both the embryo of the future schedule of study and the principles that nourished it in its growth, succeeds another step of evolution more modest and less ambitious. We refer to the post-Carlovingian decadence, which is in many respects a period of disorder, darkness and barbarism. The schools, however, or at least some of them, succeeded in maintaining themselves in being, and dialectics keener and sharper than ever shine brightly in the general intellectual darkness.

Meanwhile the increasing needs of the practical side of Christian life and of the episcopal jurisdiction gave birth to a whole series of canonical collections, which gradually widened out into manifold

branches, some of them resulting in being directly or indirectly the sources of Peter Lombard.²

A new step forward in the elaboration of a theological system was taken towards the middle of the eleventh century owing to the progress of the intellectual movement, to the Berengarian controversy and to the investiture struggles, which were fought, as has been said, "with the pen still more than with the sword." The foreground in this new aspect of things is claimed by the questions concerned with the sacraments and the systematization of canon law. Chief among the lights of this period are Peter Damian (†1072), Bernold of Constance (†1100), Anselm of Lucca (†1086), Ives of Chartres (†1116), etc. They lay down the foundation of that abundance of materials from which were later drawn up those orderly compilations, among which the work of the "*Magister Sententiarum*" holds a conspicuous place.

Less than fifty years later there is ushered in the dawn of a new era—the era of Abelard (†1142) and Hugh of S. Victor (†1141)—under the stress of the ever-increasing activity in scrutinizing the contents of revelation and accompanied by the excesses to which the "dialectici" were borne and the growing tendency to dogmatic speculation that more than once resulted in heterodoxy. It was the turn now for the labors of the systematizing of theology that followed naturally upon the codification of canon law. It was now also that the modest theologian of Novare came from Bologna to Paris under the recommendation of the Bishop of Lucca to S. Bernard, and by him in turn recommended to the Victorines. Ten years later appeared his "*Liber Sententiarum*," a synopsis of all the preceding works, which sometimes appropriates whole pages of its predecessors, and in any case invariably shows the influence of their principles, their methods and their solutions.

We shall take a rapid view of this long process of elaboration. But the limits we have proposed to ourselves in the present article confine us to the periods preceding the twelfth century.

I. PERIOD OF THE CARLOVINGIAN SCHOOLS.

When we speak of the theological teaching of the Carolingian schools it would be wrong to think it is the same in matter and method as that of the universities of the thirteenth century or the seminaries of the nineteenth. Indeed, there is little to warrant us

² To facilitate matters, the writer will bring together in this chapter all particulars touching the canonical collections. Next, of necessity, he remounts back for a moment to the precarolingian epoch, that he may show in one panorama the whole development of this canonical literature, and redescends once more through all the period stretching down to the twelfth century.

in ascribing to this theological instruction anything more than the reading and explanation of the Bible, of the works of some of the Fathers and of the liturgical prayers and customs of the Church. Besides, in the actual organization of these schools, as mirrored in the works of contemporaries, theology does not appear as the crowning point of the rest of the strictly school system, but rather, besides in what private study there might have been, it finds its true place in the immediate surroundings of the Bishop or of the "presbyter" of the parish. We shall not, therefore, look to the educational reorganization effected by Charlemagne for the beginnings of theological teaching in the proper sense of the word. It is only little by little and slowly that the word theology³ comes to take on the meaning we give it to-day; for a long time it meant nothing more in the West than any knowledge that had God for its object or was synonymous with the "sacra pagina," following close upon Denys the Areopagite, translated in the ninth century. But the spirit of the schools is altogether ecclesiastic, and in this way they give us the first hint of what was afterwards the regular theological discipline. Among other features is found, as has been said before, that devotion to dialectical speculation that in later times forced its way into the domain of sacred studies.

The entire curriculum comprised the seven liberal arts,⁴ in accordance with the ancient Roman tradition that found what is frequently—perhaps too frequently—considered a unique refuge in the British Isles, and thence spread with renewed vigor over the Continent. The starting point of the religious studies was the "Artes" of the Trivium and the "Scientiae" of the Quadrivium, bequeathed by Cassiodorus to the Western schools as a preparation for the study of the Bible. The very reason for the institution and continuance

³ The history of this word "theology" would offer an interesting object for a study a "sémantique." It shall suffice here to add to the significations already indicated, the opposition used, especially by the Greek fathers, between "theologia" and "oeconomia" (dispensatio). The latter word concerns, above all, the work of the son of God in His human nature, and survives, as well as its meaning of "dispense"—that is, of a law—up to the twelfth century, and even later in the West. The indefiniteness of the sense of the word "theology," as of the classification of knowledge in general, shows itself clearly still in the twelfth century in the attempts at rational classification made by several authors, Hughes of S. Victor, Dom. Gundissalinus, etc., and dependent more or less on Isidore, Cassiodor, etc., who in their turn were dependent on the Greeks.

⁴ It would not be deprived of interest to follow up through past generations the appreciation of this subordinated place assigned to the seven arts and later to philosophy. Such expressions as "servus," "mancipari," etc., concern at first their place in the curriculum of instruction and the legitimacy of their study for a Christian; later on they refer principally, or even exclusively, to the doctrinal superiority of theology in its relation to philosophy: the meaning had moved from the paedagogic to the doctrinal and dogmatic standpoint.

of these first studies is found in their value as a preliminary or propædæutic training, which was their only claim to legitimacy in the eyes of a Christian teacher. This is true in theory at least; for in practice it must be confessed that they sometimes took a different direction, even among the Irish monks, poets and travelers "pro gloria Christi," as well as missionaries who periodically poured in hosts over the Continent from the Emerald Isle and had their share in the revival of learning in the eighth and ninth centuries. One of the most influential precursors of the Carolingian renaissance, Venerable Bede (†735), is strongly in favor of this subordinated place assigned to the seven arts; Boniface, or Winfrid (†754), another precursor who paved the way to the Carolingian renaissance, is nearly of the same opinion, although he may be looked upon as a scholar for his time. Alcuin (†804), Charlemagne's "intellectual Prime Minister," is the heir direct of Bede's ideas, and the same may be said of Theodulf (†821), one of the originators and founders of the country schools. Not less convincing than all this is the old comparisons with the remains of Egypt or the Hebrew captive which is becoming classical since Cyprian Jerome, etc., and is to be found everywhere during the Middle Ages, theologians, exegetists, annalists, biographers, poets, etc., making use of it continuously. In this respect the capitulars of the great Emperor and legislator are strict and formal. If we read, for example, the famous capitulary, truly epoch-making in the history of education, written about 785-790, we will realize that the very end in view assigned to the study of grammar is altogether subordinated to that of the Bible. One might even with profit turn aside here to study how far the chapter on tropes, metonymy, etc., so much indulged in in the old grammars, gave birth to that flowery abundance of allegory that builds up a feature more curious than interesting, it is true, of the performances of material exegesis.

Rhetoric and the study of the ancient models, especially poets, which went with grammar, found a less natural place as a subordinated training. Indeed, it was in fact fruitful in producing here and there a precursor of the Humanists much like the famous Servatus Lupus (†862), Abbot of Ferrieres, who, it may be noted, played at the same time the triple rôle of a theologian, a stylist and a bibliophile.

The third branch of the Trivium, however, dialectics, which comprised the whole of philosophy, at least in the teaching programmes, claims the most distinguished names as sponsors for its great disciplinary and propædæutic value. If by this gate all kinds of philosophical problems stole in and permanently took their place in the educational system, and if thence they spread over the whole domain

of religious teaching, this is all due to the glowing eulogies lavished by the Fathers on "this storehouse of ammunition," this "kind of tactics so useful in the struggle with heresy," which from the days of S. Augustine characterizes in the eyes of the West the fascinating lady, *i. e.*, dialectics, "with the serpent in one hand and a fish book in the other," as described by Martianus Capella in his "Satyricon" and reproduced on the "discus" of Theodulf of Orleans.

This part of the programme assured for itself a more permanent and more respected place for the future by the writings of Harbanus Maurus (†856), the "primus preceptor Germaniae," who simply copied a text which is found in a more or less modified form in S. Augustine, passes through the works of Cassiodorus, Isidore of Seville, etc., and is later made use of by Abelard on the one hand, by Anselm and the "dialectics moderni" on the other. The importance and popularity it enjoyed is directly traceable in the works of verse and art from Theodulf to the end of the Middle Ages, enshrined in poetry, embroidered on sacred vestments, or carved on the portals of our old cathedrals, may still be found the emblems of the ancient study of Dialectics.

There is no need to delay over the other branches, those of the Quadrivium, the "Sciences" as they are generally called, as there is no trouble in maintaining their position as a preparation for religious studies. Even arithmetic was found necessary in order to catch the symbolic meaning of the numbers met in the Bible, as Isidore of Seville, Bede, etc., have written. Here, as elsewhere, the Carolingian legislation is not at fault. It lays down as necessary for the celebration of feast days, for the singing of office, etc., that training in chant, in computum, etc., that was furnished by the Quadrivium.

Beside such educational arrangements by which a mere propaedeutic place was assigned to the seven arts and the way paved to the expansion of Dialectics, there were other regulations, mainly due also to Charlemagne, which left their mark on early theological elaboration. We would speak of the capitulars who attended especially to the formation of the clergy and who pass under a form sometimes identical in the episcopal or conciliary prescriptions. Needless to say, the ideal aimed at was not very high. The religious needs of the people scarcely emerged from paganism, the intellectual level of the recruits to the sacerdotal ranks, the social and political disorder which delayed for a long time the intensity of the spiritual life, all this forced the people to be content with what was strictly necessary. In spite of this these modest forerunners of our present seminaries represented, as we have said above, by the presence of one or two clerks to be instructed besides the Bishop or the

"parochus," are instructive helps in following closely the progress of religious education. Understood in the present meaning of the word, or even considered in the still rudimentary shape that it will take in the twelfth century under the great "magister divinitatis," Anselm of Laon, one may say that the teaching of theology hardly exists. Outside of what is required to be known for the ceremonies of religion and parochial work, besides the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and, above all, the "Quicumque," to be explained to the people, not much in the way of learning is required by the capitulars and local councils. Scarcely will they show any advance on the state of Great Britain, as is evidenced by the canons of the Council of Cliff in 747. Preaching will consist in the translation into the vernacular of the homilies of the fathers for want of better; theory will be reduced to some rules of chant and ecclesiastical computation. The sacerdotal library will content itself with some Biblical and liturgical books "as correct as possible," a collection of canons, a penitential and some writings of the "orthodox Catholic fathers," above all the forty homilies of S. Gregory so well known at the Merovingian epoch that one cannot turn over the pages of a semi-uncial manuscript without meeting with some extract from them. The legislations peculiar to each diocese reproduce frequently, in whole or in part, the same recommendations for a century or more. Their presence in the case of Regino Prüm (†915), Atto of Vercell (†960), Ratherius of Verona (†974), and before that of Harbanus Maurus, etc., points out and at the same time explains the influence they exercise in the direction impressed on the movement of minds.

We must not omit here, although we cannot enter into the details, the numerous ecclesiastical capitulars which bear on the disciplinary, religious or sacramentary institutions. Before becoming a doctrinal body which systematizes them these institutions pass in some manner into the life of the Christian people or its ministers, and their development after ages cannot but be felt even in the theories which expose them.

So rich for the expansion of ecclesiastical institutions and consequently of the doctrinal tradition that they reflect, the carlovingian capitulars in all these domains are one of the factors which, joined to the stability of the teaching of the Church and to the purely reproductive tendencies of these ages, appear to have a preponderating influence on the theological writings of the whole period. The insistence which is shown on each page of the Carlovingian religious legislation to inculcate respect for the Catholic writings bequeathed by previous centuries and to only admit the works of the "orthodox Catholic fathers," would give almost the impression that one hears the voice of a Pontiff renewing the so-called decree of Gelasius, a

thing which would be surprising if one did not know from another source the astonishing extent of this organizing genius who found the means to include in his preoccupations, side by side with the high military, civil and judiciary administration, the plantations of his gardens, the missals of the parishes, the secret of the confession and the holy oil for the sick on Maundy Thursday. The theologians of the Middle Ages are indebted to him for the very text of the Latin Bible, since the whole history of the Vulgate, as Berger says, is reduced at this moment to the struggle between the text of Alcuin-Charlemagne⁵ and the bad text of Theodulf, down to the day when the stationers of the University of Paris will deliver the text "corrigé," which was to serve as matter for the Clementine revision.

The carrying out of a part of the ordinations regarding the respect of ancient writings took place, moreover, under the eyes of the Emperor, and more than one book of homilies he himself presented to the clergy, as it were, with the imperial seal. With these collections, edited by his order and destined for the liturgical office or for preaching, the survival and diffusion of a certain number of patriotic texts could be guaranteed, and a theological arsenal was built up or a patriotic repertory, the ideas, tendencies, terminology of which will have their ramifications extended to far later writings. Such a selection, as stated at the same time among the writers, still more accentuates or definitively establishes the preponderating weight of certain among them whom the merits of their works or the sympathies of readers had already placed in evidence. It is now that Bede surpasses all the writers of the post-patristic period, and our age has not deprived him of this distinction owing to the transmission of the homiletic literature of the Breviary. For others the high reputation which draws a halo about their name will but increase to the extent of bringing them to be regarded as inspired by the Holy Spirit. At the same time those first groupings are to be traced in the Western theology of the ninth and tenth centuries, which will give to four of them the title of Doctor of the Church.

By the side of these works, ordered or patronized by Charlemagne, may be placed the liturgic efflorescence, in the case of Amalar (†835) excessive allegorization, in that of Walafrid Strabo (†849) more carefully historical, the one and the other being the result of the ritual reformation already commenced under Pepin the Short and powerfully furthered by his son. The import of these works is undeniable, hardly second to those which followed them in the next century, such as Bernold of Constance (†1100), Ives of Chartres

⁵ A detailed analysis of the theological work which is associated with the name of Charlemagne merits a study that would certainly be remunerative. We only indicate here the chief points, and we do so very briefly.

(†1116), Bruno of Segni (†1123), etc., who borrowed much from their predecessors. In these liturgical treatises, as in those homilies, we especially find many statements which lead to the symbolic explanation of the sacred rites or to that sacramental terminology which will maintain for so long in the theological language the "Sacramentum Incarnationis," the first expression of which may be traced back to the Fathers. The theological treatises of the twelfth century will build on it one of their central chapters, and although Peter Lombard will be an exception to the rule, at least in a certain way, S. Thomas will take up the idea, if not the word, in the prologue to the third part of his *Summa*.

Would we now turn from the theoretical and legislative domain and have a glance at the controversies and theological works of the period, we would find that their characteristics correspond to the trend of thought that we have met with up to the present day in the capitulars and in the school regulations. From all what precedes there has been shown in advance that the time is not ripe for any theological systematization whatever, still more so for the birth of any sort of personal science. But everything shows the tendencies and points out the elements which are to continue down to the twelfth century, *i. e.*, culture of dialectics and literary reproduction. For the present time the latter is the more important feature; of the former we have already spoken when treating of the schools, and very soon we will be concerned again with it, for even dialectical work at first was nothing much more than mere reproduction.

John Scot Erigena, whose name is met with in well nigh all the philosophical or theological debates of the second Carlovingian age, stands alone among all his contemporaries, "a veritable column of basalt standing isolated in the level plain." He bequeaths his thoughts to posterity, who at first follow him charily, as a riddle to be solved. To be added to the other sources of his later intellectual influence is his translation of the works of the so-called Denys the Areopagite, recently sent from Rome to Paris and which caused a scholar as was Anastasius the Librarian (†885) to wonder at the rendering of a barbarian living on the confines of the world. The translation and as well as it the commentary of John left a deep impression in the later theological and mystical speculation of the West.

In the case of other writers, despite the real talent that cannot be denied to several, the didactic works or the theological disputations will provoke above all a great effort to revive the past. For a long time yet the compiling and encyclopædic tendencies that evidence patriotic decline lead the enfeebled thought to record simply the scientific or religious learning of the past. In the steps of the

laborious monk of Jarrow-Wearmouth, by whom a choice had already been made in the accumulated materials, many an imitator would follow. Among these is preëminent the illustrious Abbot of Fulda, one of the most learned theologians of the day, who left in his "*de instructione clericorum*" a pedagogical work of lasting influence; but the personal thought of which is traceable only in the choice of the extracts themselves and the transitions which bind them together.

In the controversies of the eighth and ninth centuries the chief source of argument lies in the repetition of ideas of the past which are noted sometimes as if in a catalogue or in long series of texts detached either from the writings of the fathers or rather from the "*Flores*," "*Excerpta*" or other collections. Gottschalck (†867) will tire his opponents, who, however, will take their weapons at the same arsenals by reciting patristic texts. Paschasius Radbert (†865) and others will open this long series of discussions with texts (a question not yet closed even in our own days) as to the true idea of S. Augustin on the Holy Eucharist. A few years earlier are to be found throughout the writings of Alcuin of Ratramnus (†868), etc., against the Adoptianists of Spain or on the questions of the "*Filioque*" and the "*Images*," long retrospective studies which permit those discussions to be regarded above all as the last reëchoing of the great christological, trinitarian or soteriological debates of the patristic golden age.

We experience the very same impression in a hurried glance over the libraries of the time. It is here in these same libraries that the twelfth century will be beholden even materially to the ninth. We have seen that the literary productions of the time bear forcible evidence of the reproductive tendencies; moreover, the collections of "*Flores*, *Sententiae*, *Excerpta*," by which the work of selection has already been done, facilitates that of copying. These collections, in fact, are frequently met with in the libraries of the ninth century, which is clearly shown by the catalogues still existing. From this period, then, they will be multiplied incessantly. S. Augustine evidently is thoroughly ransacked. His ideas, manner of expression, in fact, his entire works furnish all the authors of the Middle Ages. This is true to such an extent that before attributing the paternity of any one new contribution to some writer of the Middle Ages it is always well beforehand, as among the Byzantine writers is the case for S. Gregory and others, to consider whether Augustine has not a claim to it. One of the most conspicuous is Isidore of Seville with his "*Etymologies*," in which he has classified as in a herbarium the remains of ancient knowledge, but especially with his "*Sententiae*" or "*De Summa Bono*," a treatise chiefly moral and one of the most

frequently read and copied up to the end of the Middle Ages. Side by side with him we may cite the "Excerpta" of Paterius (†604), borrowed from S. Gregory the doctor with whom, as has been said, "the Middle Ages took its rise," as also the four books of Tayon of Saragosse (†651), "Sententie," to which was soon added a fifth. Very soon they found their way into France and were received by the Abbot of S. Ricquier with the highest marks of gratitude that manifested the esteem he had for the book. Finally is to be quoted the "Prognosticon futuri seculi," kind of treatise "de Novissimis," which Julian of Toledo copied chiefly from S. Gregory and which was destined to win for itself such brilliant success during the centuries that were to follow. Even Peter Lombard did not deem it unworthy of himself to borrow from this source.

In the exegetical literature the same trend is to be met with from the "Interrogationes" of Alcuin, really a channel of derivation destined in its course to carry several old hackneyed questions into the "book of Sentences," up to the "Glossa Ordinaria" of the Abbot of Reichenau. This latter is the principal patristic repertory, to which new additions are being made continually from the day of its publication by Walafrid Strabon. It will also be turned to profitable account by Peter Lombard and be even quoted by him under the simple title of "auctoritas" to such an extent that for this, as it seems, he receives numerous reproaches from contemporary divines.

Pure speculation is far from having escaped the contagion of the pure reproductory movement. Even later on the first essays of dogmatic synthesis, like that of the "Magister Sententiarum," can hardly be said to present philosophical ideas in an assimilated or original style. The philosophical or rather dialectical discussions on the Universals—for it is from the dialectical point of view that the question was broached—which appeared so important to some historians as to constitute by themselves alone the whole mediæval philosophy, owe their origin to the ancient summaries destined for use in the schools. And just as if the stimulant of interrogation had been necessary to arouse the curiosity of our Fathers, the very existence of the problem will be only revealed to them by the questions of Boethius in a text which will pass through centuries, soliciting numberless endeavors to answer them. Of the two principal branches into which the solutions are divided, the first was furnished to mediæval writers by the same Boethius. Marcianus Capella, one of the greatest popularizers of the programme of the seven arts, had handed down a text which constituted the second, that of nominalism. None of these answers, however, with their manifold shade of meaning, which was offered in the next period, could outstep the limits of the paths already well trodden by ancient Greek thought.

While dealing with dialectics we approached once more the subject of the Carlovingian schools. We must now follow their destiny through one or two centuries, in which the dialectical tendencies on the one hand and the positive bent of mind on the other may be traced marching side by side. They are gathering strength both, either in the obscure gymnastic of school exercises or in the daily go and come of parochial and episcopal duties. The theological sterility of this period permits us to be very brief.

2. PERIOD OF THE POST-CARLOVINGIAN DECADENCE.

The fall of the Carlovingian dynasty, towards the end of the ninth century, ushers in a period of decline during which the work of Charlemagne decays in a proportion, into the details of which we need not enter here, as we are only concerned with the schools and theological work. Despite the incursions of the Northmen, of the Arabians and the Hungarians; despite the acts of pillage committed by the nobles and the barbarism of the rabble, the schools continue to exist. Gradually even they develop, especially in France, Italy and Lotharingia, although some are not able to outlive the outbreak of such a social and political storm. Germany is left far behind, the renown which the brilliant institutions of Francony and Souabe had won for themselves passing to their neighbors of the West. Here it takes up its final abode, especially in the cathedral schools. The "Sciences" and the "Arts" of the ancient programme of Cassiodorus enjoyed an ever increasing extension which caused them to be taught separately, according to the special aptitudes of the reputed professors, rather than all together. Hence it is that Gerbert (†1003), for instance, towards the middle of the tenth century will visit several centres of learning to become initiated successively in the study of grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, etc. Often the study of medicine is added on, as had already been the case in some ancient programmes of the Roman period handed down by Isidore. Such now was the case of S. Gallen, which outlived the period of glory of Fulda and Reichenau and, moreover, did not neglect the study of the mother tongue. Several books of the Bible, works of the Fathers, dialectical treatises, were translated there into German. Also at Chartres medicine was taught. The library, which possessed the work of the Greek physician, "Oribase," attracted many a student. At this time, indeed, the local and international exchanges brought about by the passion of study begin to become frequent in Western Europe. Those which took place in the ninth and the tenth centuries may be regarded as the prelude of the great exodus to the cosmopolitan university centres. Here the doctors, invited by powerful protectors, pass from chair to chair,

sometimes to the great displeasure of their hierarchical superiors, as in the case of Hubald of Liège (about 990), who was summoned back from Paris by his Bishop. The disciples follow the masters or become in turn the auditors of the most renowned professors, thus transplanting the ideas and works of one country into another. The trace of this multiplying intellectual intercourse is found even in the "*Rouleaux des Morts*," kind of mortuary letters, with petitions for prayers, graced with pieces of rhyme and precious for the information they afford us about the schools and their changes of fortune.

By the discussions of the schools, which from the Carlovingian period crowned the renowned dialecticians with a halo of glory, we are presented in the tenth century with a long line of professors, by which we may ascend from Abbot of Fleury (†1004), Odon (†942) and Remigius of Auxerre (†908) up to Heiric of Auxerre (†880) and Servatus Lupus (†862), and from this latter to H. Raban of Fulda (†856), Alcuin (†804) and Bede (†735). Such discussions, bringing in their train the publication of treatises and commentaries, which were more numerous and sometimes much less superficial than we might be tempted to believe, had the great advantage of whetting the minds of those generations. The dialectical subtlety, which was destined to play such an important rôle in the theology of the Abelardian era, began then to try its strength and to perfect its ways of acting in this palaestra. It is thus that Anselm (†1109) will be formed half a century later, he the philosopher and theologian of the Abbey du Bec, whose name will bring to a most glorious termination the great period of the Benedictine schools. As a matter of fact, he was the first who resolutely enters, not as novice, but as a master, into the domain of metaphysics. Dialectics had been the tiny instrument by means of which the whole science of philosophy would shine forth one day in all its splendor.

Theology still continued to be what it was formerly—a study of the Bible—and some of the Holy Fathers a practical knowledge of the symbols, canons and ritual ceremonies. It figures in the teaching rather outside the schools and mainly, if not exclusively, under the form of immediate and practical preparation to the sacred functions. On the other hand, the biographies of the time do not fail to point out how much they praise the propædæutic character of the seven arts in exposing "*con amore*" the progresses realized in grammar, in dialectics, etc., by the holy Bishops and abbots, whose lives they are writing and who owe to their practice of this preparation their elevation to episcopacy or abbacy.

As far as we can judge from the writings of the time, there is as yet no production in which the revealed truths are expressed in a

systematic body of doctrine. Life is entirely given over to action devoted to the moral reform, which is personified by several renowned Bishops or by the monks of the Clunisian branch. The controversies are much less numerous than a century earlier, some of which even by their very names bear witness to the vulgarity of the minds of those engaged. The one which is associated with the name of Heriger of Lobbes (†1007), and not with that of Gilbert, as it seems, continues the discussion of Paschasius Radbert and Ratramnus. Germany produces practically nothing, although some wish to take the few pages published along the Danube or the upper Rhine as an early production in which may be traced back the German religious spirit of later times. If we put aside a few Biblical commentaries whose originality is doubtful, to say the least, and the works of a rather exceptional personal touch due to the enigmatical pessimist and penitent named Rathier of Verona (†974), we meet with nothing else but canonical codifications in which theology often has an important part and with which we will soon be occupied, for they will require, indeed, our attention owing to their influence upon theological work.

Thus in summing up we see that this period may rightly be entitled that of schoolmasters; they reign, indeed, almost everywhere. The minds become subtle in grammatical, dialectical, arithmetical exercises; sometimes they indulge in cultivating the flowers of poetry, in imitation of the ancients, as did Hrosvitha (†973), the learned Abbess of Gandersheim. In Italy the "Grammatici" aroused the emulation of Germany, which was on the decline, as said before, and, wandering as they were all over Occidental Europe, became cosmopolitan professors. Germany produced some "Schulbucher," whereas Lotharyngia, urged by the example of Brun of Cologne (†965), trained Bishops and professors for the whole empire. In France the effort persisted and grew more and more fruitful, being, however, more or less exclusively confined to the schools north of the Loire, while Adhemar of Chabannes (†1030) says one of the most important annalists of the time, is nothing but an eulogium for the southern part. But Paris, Chartres, Reims, Le Bec, Angers, etc., are names which will remain henceforth renowned in the history of letters of the tenth and eleventh centuries. As regards Poitou and Anjou, the fame of their schools is reflected even on their nobles, which is a very rare feature of this period, in which in Germany, as in France, as a whole, women are generally less unlearned than their husbands. One of the pedagogical glories of Reims changed his name of Gerbert of Aurillac for that of Silvester II. near the end of the tenth century. A great many professors, "scholastici" as was the term used, were afterwards consecrated Bishops. One of them,

Fulbert of Chartres (†1029), in all probability native of Italy, like Lanfranc (†1089) and later Anselm, passed down to posterity as a "great educator" of his contemporaries. Grouped around his chair, which draws so many pupils from France, England, Lotharingia, etc., are to be found almost all the writers which we meet with in the Berengarian controversy, the few others coming from Le Bec, the renown of which Lanfranc had begun to establish; but the fame of this great Benedictine school was not destined to descend beyond the generation of Anselm, while Chartres' glory outlived it very long.

With these two names of Fulbert of Chartres, with whom are associated those of Berenger (†1088), Adelman (†1053), Alger of Liège (†1130), Guitmond of Aversa, etc., we are at the dawn of a new era in theological development. In this the progress of dialectics extends its excursions well beyond its original boundaries and applies all the resources of its subtle research to what is contained in revelation. This movement, besides being quite natural and, in a certain measure, necessary for every mind that seeks the why and the how, did not originate all at once. Already for more than a century it was vaguely taking shape, groping along, often with an awkwardness of manner that would only provoke pity if at the end of its first attempts were not to be seen on the horizon the bright light of S. Anselm's genius. This it is which fills with interest the pages in which are preserved for us the first traces of these journeys of adventure on the dark sea of speculation, although not infrequently they do not rise above mere child's play in dialectics, imprisoned as they are in the formalism of technical expressions which they little or badly understood and applied. Such, for instance, is the case with John of Gorze (†974), near the Rhine, who in the tenth century called to his aid, as Alcuin had done in the eighth century, the categories of Aristotle, exposed by Boethius, to make clear in a passage he read in S. Augustine the explanation of the Holy Trinity. Such, again, was the case with Heriger (†1007) of Lobbes, the "vallis scientiæ" near the Sambre, who brings into line the best of his artillery by announcing in a pompous manner: "Ut forti syllogismo concludam," and an old manuscript goes so far as to indicate with big majuscules the major, the minor and the conclusion of the syllogism. Besides these, to quote only a few Williran of Ebersberg (†1085) in Bavaria, noticed with his own eyes and dolefully complains of the growing invasion of dialectics, endeavoring to explain by its own aid the sacred text. Lanfranc only, he said, made an exception to this rule. The monks even of the cloister of Ratisbonne or the pupils of the "Domschul" of Mayence interpret the Bible by the third science of the trivium, which they prefer to

the inspired text, to the great despair of the melancholic othlon of S. Emeran (†1072). Again, in the works of Adalberon of Laon (†1030), not yet printed, the Latin versification adds its own darkness to the obscure subtleties of wild speculation, which busies itself, as it will do for a long time to come, with the relations of the Divine Persons of Holy Trinity, whilst among the preachers Aristotle is quoted by Rodulphus Ardens (†1101) in a sermon on confession. Everywhere dialectics was playing its part far outside the programme of the schools. It invaded the glossary of S. Gallen, as that of Papias (†1053), who, however, only desired to compile an elementary work of great utility, as he himself says, for his children; it creeps into the teaching of Roman law, which once again comes to the fore, especially in Italy; it takes possession of the portals of our cathedrals, as, for instance, in Chartres, Reims, Auxerre, etc., in which are carved its emblems with special love; it penetrated even into the courts of Popes and Emperors, who were either kind or vain enough to act for eight hours as arbiters between two champions who disputed with strong and noisy arguments whether a reasonable being deserves such an appellation even when it does not make use of its reason or whether in the tree of Porphyry the branch denoting mortality should not come above that denoting intellect.

Although it has been much exaggerated in its applications, such an exercise had the priceless advantage of sharpening the wits. This it is which gives it its future fertility. This progress in philosophical conceptions and also in the way of exposing them, left a very traceable mark in the writings centre round the controversy of Berenger. We are able to follow it step by step in the long line of authors who defend Catholic dogma with arguments and reasonings that become more and more perfect.

But before passing to this new stage of theological elaboration, which we may call the period of "monographs," we must fix our attention on another important factor in theological classification whose progress parallels that of dialectics and becomes stronger and stronger during the tenth and eleventh centuries, up to the point of setting in motion the pen of theological systematizers. We are concerned now with a long series of canonical collection built up during three or four centuries, up to the time of the "Decretum" (1143) of Gratian. It is on this practical ground, rather outside of the schools and in episcopal surroundings, that the first step was taken towards the codification of the data acquired. Here begun a series of mutual exchanges between mediæval theology and canon law in process of formation. With these compilations, often mingled up with dogmatic matters, begun the work of bringing theology

to a complete systematic body, and for this reason they require of us a retrospective glance which will meet the defect of explanation, which the attention given by us to two centuries of dialectical improvement has forced us to omit.

3. PERIOD OF CANONICAL CODIFICATION.

However little one may have looked through the voluminous canonical literature which precedes the *Decretum* of Gratian, a centre to which converge all the previous works, one notices without any difficulty the marked preference given in the seventh and eighth centuries to systematic compilations. The methodical "*Compendia*" of Crescensius (seventh-eighth century) and Fulgentius Ferrandus (about 530), it is true, were little known outside Africa, but very early a systematic index was added to the big chronological collection which circulated under the name of Isidore of Sevilla. The same was done with the collection of Dionysius Exiguus (†556). A far greater efficiency was thus added to both works, in which the matters were compiled according to the chronological order. To the same systematical arrangement is also partly due the success of the "*Hiberna Collectio*" at its first appearance in the eighth century. After the heavy compilation work of the Pseudo-Isidor (about 850), which follows in several parts of his forgeries the succession of Popes as stated in the "*Liber Pontificalis*," the methodical classification begins to become exclusive, or nearly so, of any other. Such was the abundance of this literature, brought about by the desire of a reform, the requirements of daily administration in the dioceses, the benefits of a manual in which should be found everything connected with the instruction and government of the flock, as in the case of Regino of Prüm (†915), who gives us in his prologue the outlines of his plan and scope, that within the narrow limits of three centuries, from the false *Decretals* up to the "*Decretum*" of Gratian, there are to be quoted more than fifty works of canonical compilations, a great many of which are of no small importance either in length or in value.

Already in the tenth, and especially in the eleventh century, many chapters which follow one another in a systematical order are to be found in these collections relating to theological matters. Pre-ëminent among them is the big collection entitled the "*Decretum*" of Burchard of Worms⁶ (†1025), an old pupil of the school of Lobbes, near the Sambre, which has been so often copied, summed

⁶ We are astonished that such names as Burchard, of Worms; Anselm, of Lucca, etc., have not, in spite of the theological chapters contained in their canonical collections, found a place in the "*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*" of Vacant-Mangenot. A similar remark applies with respect to the names of Charlemagne, Anselm, of Laon, etc.

up or at least utilized for similar productions even outside Germany, in France or Italy, up to the time of Ives of Chartres—*i. e.*, end of the eleventh century. It contains no small parts, even a whole book out of seventeen, on theological questions such as predestination, eschatology, baptism, penitence, sacred ceremonies, etc. This mingling up of theology and canon law was not new; the way had been paved to it very early in the East by the Theodosian and Justinian Codex, and literary activity in the West was destined to indulge in it to the extent of making it one of the characteristic features of theology up to the middle of the eleventh century. A great impulse in this same direction was evidently given by the "Investitures Quarrel," which gave birth to an immense canonical and polemical activity. Here is to be found the development of many chapters connected with the validity of sacraments or the prerogatives of the Holy See which will find their way into the following treatises of theology. Italy and France are especially productive in this period, each with his special characteristics. To such canonical or theologico-canonical collections, like those of Ives of Chartres (†1116), Bonizo of Sutri (†1090), Anselm of Lucca (†1086), Alger of Liège (†1130), etc., theology is much indebted for several of its theses. Together with the controversial literature provoked by the Investitures, they furnish theology with many important elements, different ways of grouping matters or classifying sacraments, sundry arguments in favor of or against the validity of the sacraments administered by simoniacal or excommunicated priests, etc. Even the definition of a sacrament, which is becoming usual at the time of Abélard (†1142) and will be completed later on, is to be met with in those canonical compilations before we find it in strictly theological treatises.

Ives de Chartres, the most remarkable of the canonists prior to Gratian, gives it perhaps the first, but he is wrong in attributing it, as he formulates it, to S. Augustin. From Ives' "Decretum" this definition finds its way into the works of Alger of Liège, afterwards into those of Gratian, Roland Bandinelli (†1182), etc. A few years later Peter Lombard (about 1150), aided by Hughes of S. Victor and the "Summa Sententiarum," from which he frequently borrows or even copies, again takes the same definition, completing it by some additions which have since become classical.

Still it would be wrong to assume from what has been said thus far that theology is indebted to canonical literature for the mere idea of classifying its numerous materials accumulated during centuries or for several problems and their solutions bequeathed to her by canonical writers. Yet another field of inquiry is opened to us, in which we may discover what close relations exist between those two

branches of sacred science. We refer to the task of conciliating the patristic texts with themselves. In this line there can hardly be any doubt as to how much the systematic works of theology were dependent on canonical literature.

We do not mean to insinuate by this that the question of conciliating the patristic texts was a new one in the twelfth or the eleventh century. A long time before ecclesiastical writers had been seeking with certain anxiety a means of the Fathers or even in Holy Scripture. We have not to trace it back now. It will be enough to mention here the "*Antixeimena*" of Julian of Toledo, the same who wrote the "*Prognosticon futuri seculi*;" the "*Interrogationes*" of Alcuin upon the Bible, the "*Quæstiones in vetus*," or "*in novum Testamentum*," so often multiplied, etc. Patristical literature was not less represented in this respect than Biblical. When we look at the long series of texts and huge retrospective repertoires connected with the Carlovingian controversies upon grace, images, adoptionism, Trinity, Eucharist, etc., we cannot but think of the parallel pieces of work piled up by the Eastern Church and entitled "*Florilegia*," such as those produced by the Nestorians and their opponents, the Monophysites, Monothelites, Aphthardocetes, Iconoclasts, etc. On every side are to be found different ways suggested of conciliating views apparently contradictory. Needless to say, it is often easier to see in them powerful fecundity of imagination than sane historical interpretation. In the tenth century we meet with the name of Heriger of Lobbes, who will not hear of those reproaches of discrepancies between the Fathers. After him begin a long series of attempts at reconciliation which will remain interrupted or even become more and more lengthy. What is worthy of our attention in these attempts is not only the conviction in the minds of the authors that identity of opinion does exist always among the ecclesiastical writers. Other elements, too, creep into the discussion which render the problem of extreme nicety and of great moment—namely, the high reputation of the Fathers, some of whose names are already famous and only to be cited with extreme reverence, so much so that the very words that fall from their pen is looked upon as an oracle of the Holy Ghost. Besides this, we must take into account the nature of the argument of authority as used during the Middle Ages. A few pages from a grammarian of France, John of the Charente, in the eleventh century, repeated, in at least what regards the ideas, by a theologian of the twelfth century, Robert of Melun, are well worth reading in this respect—they show the general custom by which a text becomes by itself an argument of real value when the author has, so to speak, acquired a recognized legal standing; he is an "*authenticus auctor*," his authority may be used

as an argument. Several passages from mediæval writers may be quoted as bearing witness to or giving an explanation of this custom, for instance, the interpretation of some expressions of the so-called Gelasian Decretum "*de libris legendis et reiciendis*," so often transcribed at this time, and the prologues to some canonical compilations, such as that of Cardinal Atton, in the eleventh century. All this gave birth to many discrepancies between assertions very much distant between themselves as to time and places, and taken apart from their content they provoke as an attempt at reconciliation manifold hypotheses which are not always accompanied by the indispensable work of verification as to their reality in the actual order of things.

With the canonists, and even leaving aside all controversial tendency, such as the quarrel of Investitures, which accounts for a considerable number of collections of texts for or against the Holy See, the validity of sacraments, etc., the very idea of a systematic ordonnance must more than anything else have raised the same difficulties of antilogies. At the outset, it is true, the juxtaposition of texts which were more or less out of keeping with one another, did not always carry weight with writers. With the exception of modifying certain expressions incompatible with a new state of things, the work reduced itself to a matter of registration. In this connection certain pages of the much used Decretum of Burchard of Worms are suggestive. With the greater number, however, the defect must have soon become evident. War against the penitentials "*quorum auctores incerti, errores certi*," which occurred during the Carolingian period, and their replacement by new documents "*authentici*," was but a precarious remedy, correcting but a part of the practical side of the question. The remaining portions, such as jurisprudence, institutions and doctrinal matters—the later figuring largely, as we have seen, in the canonical treatises—were still extensive.

It is no wonder, therefore, that a feeling of dissatisfaction with such a state of things soon manifested itself, and this without beating about the bush. In his prologue Burchard openly complains of the incoherence and discordance of the canons. Following him comes Bernold of Constance (†1100), who is, if anything, more disheartened still; Bonizon of Sutri, whom Alger of Liège will later transcribe; Cardinal Deusdedit and others take up the complaint; Ives of Chartres does the same and more in the preface to his well-known "*Panormia*," so often separately reproduced under the name of "*Consonantia canonum*." It is not even necessary to concern ourselves here with all the other products of the eleventh or the early years of the twelfth century. The very title of Gratian's work and the glosses made on him by his commentators expose the evil side

by side with the remedy under so unmistakable a form that we are not allowed to omit it here: "De Concordantia Discordantium Canonum," such was the original title.

The methods of solution carried into practice and completed by the celebrated monk of Bologna had been sought for by the generations of theologians and canonists of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They all attempted to remedy the difficulty. Bernold of Constance began the work by taking up, as it seems, an idea of Hincmar of Reims (†882) and working away several parts of a treatise of the great Carolingian Archbishop which is no longer to be found. It is to him that Bonizon of Sutri and others applied for information and suggestions. It is hard to tell. In any case Cardinal Deusdedit (†1099) and before him the "Prisca Collectio" of Mai, gives the preference when a discrepancy occurs to the "major auctoritas," what the Ulpian's "auctoritas had been for Roman law among the Latin jurists. Abelard does not admit it, nor after him the "Summa Sententiarum," except as the last solution when every other is found to be impossible. Bernold's idea, whether consciously or unconsciously, is made use of by Ives of Chartres, "vir canonicotatos" as Bossuet calls him, and one of the greatest glories of the French canonists in his celebrated preface "de consonantia canonum." Making allowance for differences of time, place, person, etc., already mapped out before, the theory of the "dispensatio," which he develops, assumes a character more and more pronounced and which assisted him to a great extent in the work of reconciling differences. The repetition of Ives' ideas, whose text he so often makes use of, is to be recognized in Alger of Liège early in the twelfth century.

Thenceforward one has not long to wait before the principal rules for reconciling antilogies proposed by the canonists become the property of theology properly speaking. It is the "Sic et Non" of Abelard which is responsible for this work. By the memorable preface to this collection, which it explains in a sense far removed from that spirit of skeptical rationalism with which it has been credited for a long time, is added to the preceding process a new and epoch-making method. This is the use of dialectics, which is employed for pointing out different meanings for the same word in different authors. Gratian is superior to his predecessors in canon law, among other things in this, that he makes use of this new means of solution erected into a principle by Abelard's work. And thus theology, so often indebted to canonical collections, takes an active share in the exchange of mutual services. Gratian also did not lay behind; he put numerous resources within reach of the "Magister Sententiarum," and this latter hastened to make use of them without

disguising the fact, giving another example of reciprocity between canonical and theological science in the work of systematic codification. But in this lies already the last stage in the elaboration of Lombard's book, with which we are not concerned in this article. Previous to it is the Anselmian period. We have now to look at the theological position in this time and to assist at the first attempts to build up a rational system.

4. THE PERIOD OF S. ANSELM, OR THE PERIOD OF MONOGRAPHS.

When canon law began the codification of the numerous patristic texts, pontifical and conciliar, under the guidance of Anselm of Lucca, Deusdedit, Ives of Chartres, etc., theological works were becoming more numerous than hitherto. The era of silence or of mere reproduction is closed. Times had come when theology required, as Newman says, to be "something more than the rehearsal of what her champions had achieved and her sages had established in ages passed away." It is the moment when the old and glorious Benedictine institutions shed one last but conspicuous ray of glory before they cede the ground definitively to the great cathedral schools. This short period, comprising as it does fifty years or so, brings us to the beginnings of the twelfth century. Among the characteristic features which call for our attention there are especially three which we feel obliged to treat at some length because they proved to be of real efficiency in the influence they had in the development of later theological literature.

The first characteristic, whose evidence it is difficult to contest if only one has read some of the writings of the period, is the very strong antagonism between the opposing parties as to the use of speculation and dialectics in sacred sciences. Augustine, Isidore, Alcuin and Harban Maur, as said before, had bestowed on dialectics their unstinted praise, but despite this a long and violent struggle had to be undergone before dialectics could make fair its claim on the ground of sacred science. The sermons of this period, the correspondence of schoolmasters and ecclesiastical notabilities, the commentaries of some rare exegetists and even the chronicles and the notes of literary historians, which, unfortunately, are not numerous, enable us to hear again the echoes of that antagonism which at times sounded somewhat loud. The opposition did not limit itself to one country alone; it is met with in Italy, in Peter Damian (†1072); in Alsace, in Manegold of Lautenbach (†1103), who is often at one on this matter with Peter Damian; in Bavaria, in Williran of Ebersberg, in Othlo of S. Emmeran, in Seifrid of Tegernsee (†1063); in England, in Wulfstan of Worcester (†1096), etc. Nor was France to be an exception. Long before the struggle

raged there in full force in the time of S. Bernard we see it foreshadowed in the commentary of S. Paul attributed to Lanfranc, and especially in the literature connected with the Berengarian controversy.

During a somewhat considerable time we find traces of this antagonism in the writers of every country. They show it by the need they feel to apologize or justify themselves whenever they summon up sufficient courage to present the public with the fruit of their own reflections. Even Abelard, as well as Rupert of Deutz (†1130), felt obliged to apologize for the writings of their own they produced in public. Such is the state of affairs at this period that we would not be far from the truth in describing the second part of the eleventh century as a period of contention as to the part of reason and its nature in dogmatic speculation, and not only a stage in the controversy on universal, as is too often done even in theology. It must be acknowledged that it was not without solid grounds that this intrusion of dialectics into the domain of revelation was regarded with suspicion. Sometimes it entered it in the garb of a conqueror or of a master. With many minutia which have no merit whatever as a philosophical study of dogma one could cite abuses and exaggerations which called for a speedy check. When we read now those excursions in the naked texts by which they have been preserved to us, one cannot help being astonished how human reason had been dazzled at the sight of some syllogism, pompously decked out in a subtlety as childish as it is superficial, drawn from some celebrated dialectician of the day. Those same dialecticians ambited nothing else but to undermine with their new war machine some of our principal dogmas. With the support of an "Atqui" and an "Ergo," backed up sometimes with a phrase of Aristotle taken from Boethius or some other author, they felt no difficulty in putting aside the resurrection of the dead, the virginal birth of our Lord, His resurrection, etc., etc. One might even say that skeptical rationalism has left behind a longer and more lasting trace than we would be led to believe by the obscurity and small importance of its authors. About the middle of the twelfth century, indeed, Abelard will bear witness to the same doubts oppressing the minds of some of his contemporaries. Even later on, on the eve of the thirteenth century, Alexander Neckam (†1213) reports a very curious answer made by a student of Paris about the same skeptical denials as to the resurrection of the dead. John of Cornwall (†1170) relates nearly identical doubts on several points of faith.

The events which France, and afterwards Italy, witnessed were not of such a nature, from the theological standpoint, as to gain sympathy for the cause of the dialecticians. To everybody who is

more or less acquainted with mediæval church history the part played by Berenger in the heresies on the Blessed Sacrament is sufficiently known to allow us to pass it over in silence. Nor does it fall within the limits of our essay to examine into its connection with the question of universals. Whether Berenger made his departure from the nominalism, or whether the manner in which he speaks of real presence makes him appear to arrive at it as his conclusion matters little for the present question. It is in any case certain that his manner of procedure opened the field to an unrestrained development of dialectics in dogmatic questions and fully justified the foresceing apprehensions of Fulbert of Chartres. Besides, Berenger's way of proceeding is rather curious in the case of a rationalist; even the authority of the Scripture and the Fathers was not thrown over by him. By all this is shown how little was defined for many minds the boundary line between the domain of reason and faith. The influence of John Scot Erigena, who comes again to the front after a long silence, the theory of divine illumination of intellects, and not a few ideas or expressions of the ancient doctors, partly or entirely perverted by their isolation from their context or by removal from a past epoch. All this accounts for the lack of definite boundaries between the two domains, which is felt down to the thirteenth century. Even Peter Lombard does not completely make an exception to the rule. In the case of Berenger no shadow of doubt is thrown by him on the legitimacy of dialectics into dogma; he supports his view on the matter by a text of the Book of Genesis by which is affirmed the divine resemblance in man; this, he says, being evidently founded on reason and dialectics being the best use of reason. Nothing higher on earth can exist for a rational mind than to have recourse to it as the last rule of all truth. Everybody knows to what length Berenger was driven by such a principle.

These dialectical excesses provoking, as we have said, a strong opposition, ran the risk for a while of compromising forever the place that human reason can legitimately claim in the study of dogma. But by a certain number of the faith's champions these excesses were overbalanced by a telling use of the very weapons of the enemy. The generation of S. Anselm recognized it with a satisfaction which is often pointed out in the chronicles and biographies of the day. Thus we arrive at a second characteristic which distinguishes this period—namely, the progress more and more pronounced of orthodox dogmatical speculation, and as a consequence thereof the acknowledgment, at times somewhat hesitating, of its title to legitimacy.

Here we can be brief. The facts in the history of theological literature that ring as it were the knell of the eleventh century are

well known. If in the case of some dialectics assumed an importance by far too great to admit of universal approval, several authors at least must not be said to be without real merit in this line. The polemical discussions upon Investitures and the success of French schools, especially those along the Loire and that of Bec, as well as those of Lotharingia, sharpened the mind and pruned the pen. What a picture of literary activity surpassing in richness, depth and refinement anything produced since the days of Charlemagne is now presented to the mind by the mention of names like those of Lanfranc, Ives of Chartres, Hildebert of Mans (†1134), Goeffroy of Vendome (†1132), Peter Damian, Alger of Liège, Guitmond of Aversa, Anselm of Canterbury, etc.

Methodical, exact, balanced, true jurist that he was, Ives of Chartres leaves us in his letters and sermons many a page of theological data in which the "rationes" hold a large place side by side with the "auctoritates." More than one page of the treatises from which the "*Magister Sententiarum*" will later draw his material have their source in these same data.

In the numerous writings brought to light by the discussions upon Investiture were examined from various viewpoints the problems connected with sacramental matters. The reflections and suggestions they contain prepare in a large part for the work of subsequent systematizing the minds of those who turned their attention in this direction, although the immediate literary influence of several of these dogmatical tracts is only traceable with difficulty among succeeding generations who have forgotten them.

But nowhere perhaps may the forward march of method and reasoning be more seen than in the field of the Berengerian controversy. One of the first who took a part in the discussion—Lanfranc—after following his adversary into the arena of dialectics, finally holds on to a pure formalism. To claim the victory it is enough for him to espy a flaw in the formula used by his adversary. Thenceforth the battle is at an end; he goes no further with the difficulty in question. After him others, as Alger and Guitmond, do better. They mingle much wise and solid speculation in their study of the Fathers and their inquiries about the belief of the past. In rendering them their merited praise posterity is but confirming the opinion long ago pronounced by a good judge, Peter of Cluny (†1156), who justly conferred the palm upon the Lotharingian master, one of the greatest glories of the celebrated school of Liège.

The highest indication of this progress in the speculative study of dogma and its rational exposition is undoubtedly found in the works so well marked by originality and depth of this genius who lived in advance of his time, S. Anselm of Canterbury. Here may it be

noticed with satisfaction that metaphysics is no longer relegated to a second place in favor of a merely external and often puerile formalism. It may have had need, it is true, to make its entrance by the narrow gate of dialectics, but once within the field metaphysics immediately becomes master of the situation. The scope of the present article does not allow of a lengthy development upon the famous metaphysician of dogma, but the foregoing characteristics may be so applied to the literary activity of Anselm as to warrant us in grouping them about his name. To the antagonism aroused by the "*moderni dialectici*" Anselm opposed solid speculation not less orthodox than it was profound, and while guarding against their mistakes established once for all the right to employ reason in the things of faith. His formula is well known, "*Fides quaerens intellectum*." What gives him a conspicuous place, so admirably expressed upon the frontispiece of the great editions of his works—the link he supplies between S. Augustine and S. Thomas—is the high merit of his teaching, which marks a step forward in the sacred science and crowns with unrivaled glory the long line of the famous Benedictine schools.

Finally as a third characteristic, which is common with all his contemporaries, may be noted that his work only contains monographs, with some traces of union to point out their cohesion, but which, despite their incomparable superiority, do not as yet offer us the body of the system we have been following in elaboration through three or four centuries. Natural theology, the Trinity, free will and grace, the fall of man, the incarnation and redemption—on all these Anselm leaves us detached treatises, several of which will come down the centuries with a high repute and honor.

It is early to realize that as regards this third characteristic it is the same here as with the Berengerian controversy, the dogmatical writings of Ives of Chartres, Hildebert and others, the polemics of the Investitures, the works of Odo Cambray (†1113), Herman of Tournay (†1147), etc., upon original sin or the redemption. A system of theology has not yet been brought forward, but the composing elements were at work, and that more and more so. The outcome was talked of and looked for everywhere; "*quaeri solet*" is the expression we find in every page written at that time; questions and problems are handed down from one school to another, from one master to another. The example set by the great philosopher and theologian of Canterbury was conducive to a great result. But, strange to say, it is almost exclusively in this impulse given to the intellectual movement that the immediate rôle of the "*Father of Scholastics*" is to be seen. Neither his treatises nor his doctrines, nor his method are immediately met in the schools. Ex-

cept for twice by Abelard and later by John of Cornwall, he is scarcely quoted. Honoré of Autun and Odo of Cambray, who borrow a great deal from him, make an exception to the general rule. Peter Lombard hardly seems to know him. A slight shade, if any at all, of Anselmian ideas upon original sin or redemption pierces its way into the writings of Hugo of S. Victor and of the "Magister Sententiarum." As for his method, more profound than that of the dialecticians, a superficial reading through a few pages already suffices to show the distance separating it from that of the later "Summists" or "Sententiarii." But if we want to witness the entry of Anselm into the schools we will have to wait until the thirteenth century. Till then his writings, which are read with eagerness as soon as they come from the pen of the author or of his secretaries, will have been silently spreading the renown of the learned doctor and contributing in a large measure to the intellectual growth that opened the twelfth century. Towards the years 1230-40 the quasi official reign of the theologian of Bec begins and will no more come to an end. Alexander of Hales and S. Thomas are then the chief promoters of his glory; by them the contents of his dogmatical monographs are incorporated, not always unchanged, into the great theological system of the thirteenth century. But the first codification of theology, the elaboration of which we are studying with the preparation of the work of the "Magister Sententiarum," is not directly imbued with it.

In any case, the work carried on from the Carlovingian period down to the twelfth century is of great influence for the following centuries and calls much, as we hope to have shown, for attention in the development of theological literature. Let us briefly recall the more important stages passed upon the advance. The theological works of the Carlovingian renaissance, mostly reproductions and compilations, shed a passing ray of light which is no more than a reflection of the past. As yet there is no question of anything original or of the fashioning of a system; of every author of this time may be said what is written about Bede's works on an old catalogue of the Library of Admont in Styria:

*Sicut apis mella, sic Beda legit mellora;
Incedit medius, nec humi faciet aut nimis altus.*

But the pioneers of the theological codification are preparing themselves in the schools and in the pursuits of practical life. To all this Charlemagne gives an impulse, traces of which will be found in the tendencies, materials and methods in theological teaching for centuries to come. The barbarian epoch which followed presents us with the same work of preparation silently going on, while the theologico-canonical collections were giving the first impetus to a

rational and systematic codification. After almost two centuries had elapsed, about 1050, educational progress and subtle discussions allowed of intellectual works of a more personal nature. Berenger and his adversaries, the polemist upon Investiture, the dialecticians, all present us with the spectacle of an intense theological activity. Meanwhile, the canonical literature was opening the way to an harmonious codification of the "Auctoritates." It is true, here we meet only with accumulated materials, which were often too slavishly copied, or questions presenting themselves for a future programme, or principles laid down for systematizing to follow. Theology properly so called only offers us detached writings. In these the genius of S. Anselm unquestionably surpassed everything till then published, but, unhappily, without bequeathing to the "Summists" or "Sententiarii" who followed him the depth and largeness of view characteristic of his own mind.

Whoever wishes to measure the forward progress of theology during these four centuries will find nothing more helpful than to juxtapose side by side Anselm of Canterbury and another doctor of Great Britain connected with the Carlovingian renaissance since its very dawn and whose renown as one of the intellectual glories of his time is recorded by the newly erected monument of Rocker Point, in Northumberland, near the theatre of his labors at Jarrow-Wearmouth. In Venerable Bede we see no lofty flights, no metaphysical meditations, as in S. Anselm; rather we find the obscurer work of the elementary manual, of translation and *résumé*. The differences, after all, only reflect of their times that mark the fruitful careers of these two men and whose personal character comes out in their writings so clearly are seen to best advantage in their solicitude at the last hour. Bede, whose life was spent in educating a rising generation, had only one regret as his last hour drew near, and that is that he could not finish his translation of S. John's Gospel into Anglo-Saxon; but having had time enough to dictate the last verse of his translation of the Evangelist, he died full of joy, the "Alleluia" of the "Ascension" on his lips. Drawing his inspiration from the same Bible, the source of all his meditations, Anselm dies desiring still a moment to solve the problem of the soul's origin, so much questioned again in his time. When giving up his soul to his Maker he finds his consolation in his submission to the Divine will. Both can well be called the pioneers of mediæval systematizing of theology, which each in his own sphere and age so powerfully seconded.

J. DE GHELLINCK, S. J.

Book Reviews

THE PRIEST'S STUDIES. By *T. B. Scannell, D. D.*, editor of "The Catholic Dictionary." 12mo., pp. 240. Longmans, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London; New York, Bombay and Calcutta.

This book is one of a series of handbooks designed to meet a need which, the editors believe, has been widely felt and which results in great measure from the predominant importance attached to dogmatic and moral theology in the studies preliminary to the priesthood. That the first place must of necessity be given to these subjects will not be disputed. But there remains a large outlying field of professional knowledge which is always in danger of being crowded out in the years before ordination, and the practical utility of which may not be fully realized until some experience of the ministry has been gained. It is the aim of the present series to offer the sort of help which is dictated by such experience. A commendable purpose, surely, for every priest knows the pain and humiliation of learning by practical experience what he has already learned in theory, and the mistakes and misunderstandings which might be prevented by a word of warning from those who had gone before. The author brings out this idea very well in his introduction:

"Priests in English-speaking countries must as a rule be men of action rather than men of letters. Their great occupation is the cure of souls. A portion of Christ's flock is entrusted to their spiritual charge, for whom they must offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and to whom they must administer the sacraments and preach the Word of God. The poor, the sick and the young have a special claim on their time and attention and rightly look to them for temporal as well as spiritual aid. Then, too, the management of the church and its services and perhaps also of a school, requires that a priest should be a man of practical ability, capable of ruling others and of handling money to advantage. These various duties conscientiously performed would seem to leave him little opportunity or inducement for study.

"It must be admitted that there are excellent priests who rule their parishes well and are universally respected, and yet in no sense of the word students. Some are men of exalted piety who seem to find in prayer all the help they need. Others, again, are possessed of great natural ability and do not require the aid of books. These two qualifications—piety and ability—are indeed of the utmost importance to a priest, and nothing else can make up for their absence. The people will revere a saintly pastor in spite of his want

of worldly wisdom; they will respect a born ruler even though he be not remarkable for piety; but a mere book worm they will despise. Still it will be recognized by all that a priest who is at once a man of piety, a man of the world (in a good sense) and a scholar, presents the perfect combination needed for the due exercise of the ministry.

"Some who have read thus far may be tempted to lay down this book and say that it was not intended for them. They will think that the writer, in spite of his opening sentences, aims at sending priests back to school and turning them into students rather than missionaries. Indeed, some objection was made to the title of this volume on the ground that the word 'studies' might convey a wrong idea of its contents. Nothing is farther from the writer's mind than to divert a priest from the performance of his missionary duties. Rather it is his intention to help him to a more efficient exercise of these. He hopes to show not only that most priests can find time to study, but that study is necessary for part of their work. Why should we study? When can we study? they will at once object when this necessity is set before them. If they are satisfied on these two points they will go on to ask, 'What should we study? How should we study?' In this introductory chapter some general answers will be attempted to each of these questions."

The writer treats his subject not only in a scholarly manner, but also in an attractive way, which is perhaps a rarer quality, though not so valuable. The book will serve its purpose well, and the purpose is very good.

THE POPES AND SCIENCE. *The History of Papal Relations to Science During the Middle Ages and Down to Our Own Time.* By *James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., LL. D.*, professor of the history of medicine and of nervous diseases at Fordham University School of Medicine, professor of physiological psychology at St. Francis Xavier's and Cathedral Colleges, New York, and lecturer on biology at the Catholic Summer School of Amermerica. 8vo., pp. xii.+431. Fordham University Press, New York. 1908.

The reading public has made the acquaintance of Dr. Walsh sufficiently well to know that whatever comes from his pen has been carefully chosen, fully verified and well written. He has begun to till a field which was permitted to lie fallow too long, but which is all the richer for the delay. Each new section of the field yields a rich harvest of truth. Nor is the latest the least productive. The author says of it:

"For years as a student and physician I listened to the remarks from teachers and professional friends as to the opposition of the Popes to science, until finally, much against my will, I came to believe that there had been many Papal documents issued which, inten-

tionally or otherwise, hampered the progress of science. Interest in the history of medicine led me to investigate the subject for myself. To my surprise, I found that the supposed Papal opposition to science was practically all founded on an exaggeration of the significance of the Galileo incident. As a matter of history, the Popes were as liberal patrons of science as of art. In the Renaissance period, when their patronage of Raphael and Michel Angelo and other great artists did so much for art, similar relations to Columbus, Eustachius and Cæsalpinus, and later to Steno and Malpighi, our greatest medical discoverers had like results to science. The Papal medical school was for centuries the greatest medical school in Europe, and its professors were the most distinguished medical scientists of the time. This is a perfectly simple bit of history that any one may find for himself in any reliable history of medicine. The medical schools were the scientific departments of the universities practically down to the nineteenth century. In them were studied botany, zoölogy and the biological sciences generally, chemistry, physics, minerology and even astronomy, because of the belief that the stars influenced human constitutions. The Popes in fostering medical schools (there were four of them in the Papal dominions and two of them—Bologna and Rome—were the greatest medical schools for several centuries) were acting as wise and beneficent patrons of science. Many of the greatest scientists of the Middle Ages were clergymen. Some of the greatest of them were canonized as saints. Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas are typical examples. At least one Pope has been a distinguished scientist before being elected to the Papacy. For several centuries the Popes selected as their physicians the greatest medical scientists of the time, and the list of Papal physicians is the worthiest series of names connected with any bond in the history of medicine, far surpassing in scientific import even the hall of the faculty of any medical school.

"In a word, I failed to find any trace of Papal opposition to true science in any form. On the contrary, I found abundant evidence of their having been just as liberal and judicious patrons of science as they were of art and education in all forms. I found also that those who write most emphatically about Papal opposition to science know nothing at all of the history of science, and above all of medicine and of surgery, during three very precious centuries. Because they know nothing about it they think there was none, and go out of their way to find a reason for its absence, while all the time there is a wondrous series of chapters of science for those who care to look for them. This is the story that I have tried to tell in this book.

"This material is, I think, gathered into compact form for the first time. No one knows better than I do how many defects are prob-

ably in the volume. What I have tried to do is to present a large subject in a popular way, and at the same time with such references to readily available authorities as would make the collection of further information comparatively easy. I am sorry that the book has had to take on a controversial tone. No one feels more than I do that controversy seldom advances truth. There are certain false notions, however, which have the prestige of prominent names behind them, which simply must be flatly contradicted. I did not seek the controversy, for when I began to publish the original documents on the subject I mentioned no names. Controversy was forced on me, but not until I had made it a point to meet and spend many pleasant hours with the writer whose statements I must impugn, because they so flagrantly contradict the simple facts of medical history."

This is splendid. But if the promise is so good, what may we not expect from the realization. We shall not be disappointed. The author proves his thesis in a manner convincing to any thinking man. We trust that the doctor will be able to continue without interruption the excellent series, of which the present volume forms not the least important part.

HISTORY OF ECONOMICS, OR, Economics as a Factor in the Making of History. By *Rev. J. A. Dewe, A. M.*, late professor of history in the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, and now professor of history at the University of Ottawa. 8vo., pp. 334. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. 1908.

The subject is very important and it is treated in a very attractive manner. Its importance at the present time is probably greater than ordinary, because of the financial crisis through which we are passing.

"History is no longer a study of isolated events, but rather of the workings of unseen laws and influences. As the different phenomena of chemistry and physics receive their orderly arrangement and their power to interest only from their association with certain laws, so in history the facts that make up the narrative are but the material or medium through which are conveyed the workings of laws both universal and ever constant.

"The study of history has thus lost much of the dryness and perhaps also some of the disregard in which it used to be held. No longer is it a mere committal to memory of battles and sieges, of alternating wars and treaties, of the rise and succession of dynasties. It is now a scientific research into the influences that bring about all these different results. The action of the motor power of certain laws is now seen in all the pages of history, and every event that takes place can be attributed to the action of some law.

"The study of history, therefore, has been raised to the dignity of a science, a science that specially interests the mind of the seeker after true wisdom. None other, perhaps, deals so effectively with the mainsprings of human conduct. It reveals the future by means of the past, and shows to mankind what particular environment it must seek after in order to achieve the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Moreover, to the student who has emerged from the embryo condition of the small boy this scientific study of history should hold out most fascinating attractions, since it presents the key with which to unlock some of the most actual, pressing problems of our present civilization.

"The influences or laws that shape the events of history are many and various. They may, however, all be summed up under three great categories—namely, Physical Surroundings, Religion and Economics.

"Passing over the first and second as being beyond our purpose for the present, let us give our attention to the third category of formative causes—namely, economics. This element, as we shall see, is also of the greatest importance, and this not only on account of its own intrinsic activity, but because it is so intimately bound up with the other two important formative influences in history—namely, physical surrounding and religion.

"By economics is meant the science of wealth, and this, again, means the knowledge of laws that govern the production of wealth and its distribution. We might, perhaps, express this definition in simpler terms by saying that economics is the science of how a man can make his wealth and how he gets it.

"It is evident, then, that economics must have an almost unbounded influence on human conduct, both public and private. For the great majority spend the greater part of their time either in producing or distributing wealth, and, from the point of view of extension, the time that an ordinary man has to employ in earning his daily bread is greater than that which he can possibly expend in explicit acts of religion."

The author pursues his subject along these lines through three periods, which he calls "The Greek and Roman Period," the "Mediæval Period" and the "Modern Period."

A PULPIT COMMENTARY ON CATHOLIC TEACHING. A complete exposition of Catholic doctrine, discipline and cult in original discourses by pulpit preachers of our own day. Vol. I., "The Creed." 8vo., pp. 453. Joseph F. Wagner, New York.

"The encyclical of His Holiness Pius X. in which he so strongly insists upon catechizing as one of the chief duties of the priesthood has induced the publication of this series. Our aim has been to

prepare for the priest and for the catechist a storehouse of well digested thought from which may be drawn inspiration as well as spiritual food.

"Here are to be found assembled, carefully and forcefully developed and aptly illustrated and applied, the arguments sanctioned by the Church and tested by experience which form necessarily the essential part of the definition and defense of Christian doctrine.

"While a carefully prepared plan has been followed throughout, we feel that the attractiveness of the series, no less than its value, are greatly enhanced by the fact that herein one comes in touch with the efforts of many widely known writers and preachers of our day, thus assuring to the work a great variety of form, literary style and oratorical methods.

"It is expected that these volumes will be found of value not only for ready reference on points of Christian doctrine, but also as matter for spiritual reading in religious houses, and in presenting points for daily meditation, which is well recognized as a practical if not remote method of preparation for the sacerdotal duty of catechizing.

"The series will comprise four volumes dealing in turn with the Creed, the Commandments, the Means of Grace and the Liturgy of the Ecclesiastical Year, and it is hoped that the arrangement of matter as well as the completeness of treatment will go far to meet the needs of the hour in this field."

This first volume contains fifty-three sermons, generally dogmatic, and dealing with subjects more or less directly contained in the Creed. They do not, however, form a consecutive and systematic whole. They are by different preachers, all, we believe, modern, but not all confined to this country. Their reputations are not equal, nor is their ability. Some of them contribute several sermons to the collection, and some only one. For instance, there are sixteen sermons by Bishop Bellord. Other prominent contributors to the collection are Monsignor Vaughan and Father Halpin. There are several sermons from each of them. The plan is good and the sermons are excellent. The book should have a large sale.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Books I. and II. With introduction and annotation by Madame Cecilia, religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham, S. W. 12mo., pp. xxl.+315. With maps and some illustrations. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati. 1908.

The increase of books on the Holy Scriptures from the pens of Catholic writers is a healthy sign. It dates principally from the encyclical of Leo XIII. on the subject. Concerning the purpose and plan of the book before us the author says:

"This little manual has been compiled in the hope that it may be

useful in preparing young Catholics for the university local examinations and to our Catholic pupil teachers. It is the work of one who, having been a teacher for twenty-five years, has had every opportunity of acquiring a certain experience in preparing pupils for these examinations. The following special feature will, it is believed, make it helpful to both teachers and students:

"1. The addition of the Latin text of the Vulgate will be found useful in colleges and high schools where Latin is taught. It will save both time and expense to have the Latin and English text in parallel columns.

"As kindly critics when reviewing the manual on St. Mark's Gospel have suggested that this series of Catholic Scripture Manuals would be much more useful if the English version had been compared with the original Greek, the author has profited by this suggestion in compiling this manual on the Acts of the Apostles, and has referred to the Greek text whenever such references tend to elucidate the subject, or where variant readings gave rise to different interpretations. The quotations from the Greek, however, will not prevent the student who has no knowledge of Greek from profiting by the annotations, since every quotation is translated and the prose reads consecutively when the bracketed Greek citations are passed over."

The Manual consists of four parts: Book I.: 1. Introduction. 2. Text and Annotations. Book II.: 3. Additional Notes Corresponding to the Sections of the Text and Annotations. 4. Side Lights on the Acts.

The text of the Acts has been kept entirely free from references, letters and figures, which are often confusing and invariably unsightly. As Catholics are frequently reproached with neglecting the Holy Scriptures, special attention has been paid throughout this Manual, wherever an opportunity occurred, to show that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are based on the Holy Scriptures.

The introduction is very full and satisfying; the foot notes are models of conciseness and clearness, and the fuller notes and side lights which make up the second part of the book bring it to a well rounded completeness which gives to it a value which the ability and experience of the author led us to expect, and which cause a large demand for it.

SHORT SERMONS. Second Series. By the Rev. F. P. Hickey, O. S. B. 12mo., pp. 235. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1908.

Probably there is no class of ecclesiastical literature so common at the present time as sermon books. They come from the press

very rapidly, and it is hard to keep up with the stream. The present book is the author's second venture, and he says:

"The more than kind reception accorded the first volume of 'Short Sermons' and the many requests received for another series are responsible for the appearance of this second volume. Let no one think that I was unwilling to act on their suggestions, but their very number quite precluded me from doing so.

"With very few exceptions the subject for each Sunday is taken either from the Epistle or the Gospel of the day. I have had one special object in view—'Frequent Communion'—and when the subject allowed it I have endeavored to introduce a few words on behalf of that holy practice. It is obviously the duty of every priest frequently to exhort his people to live up to the spirit of the decree of the Sacred Congregation, 'On Daily Communion,' published on December 24, 1905.

"There is a frequent need for a sermon on the sufferings of Our Lord during Lent, the very time when a priest is busier than usual. I have, therefore, added a few sermons on the Passion at the end of the volume, in addition to those on Passion and Palm Sunday.

"In alluding in the sermons on 'The Holy Family' and of the second Sunday after Easter to Loretto and the Church of 'Quo Vadis' in Rome, I am well aware that there are some who doubt and even deny the authenticity of these events, but I prefer and love to cling to the pious traditions of the Church until they are discountenanced or condemned by authority."

These sermons are very good. They are short, but clear, logical and forceful.

THE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE RELIGION OF MODERN SOCIALISM. By *Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.*, author of "Data of Modern Ethics Examined." 12mo., pp. 387. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1908.

The growth of socialism, even in our own country, makes it an unusually pregnant subject. It is one which appeals to all classes and one which is worthy of the most powerful pen. Much has been written on it, especially in very recent years, but the subject is by no means exhausted. Father Ming says:

"Since socialism has of late engrossed public attention, many questions have arisen concerning its real nature and tendency. There is no doubt that obviously it presents itself at once as an economic system advocating socialization of ownership and production, and as a social movement having for its avowed object the emancipation of the working classes from oppression by modern capitalism.

"But it is often asked, and not without reason, whether as an

economic system it is not resting on a materialistic conception of society and of the world at large, as its philosophical basis, and whether as a social movement it aims at freedom from capitalistic domination only and not also from the laws imposed by moral and religious convictions.

"Yet though such questions have been frequently asked, they have thus far not been thoroughly discussed. It is generally understood that Karl Marx and Frederick Engels are the intellectual authors of modern socialism, but the works in which, as in original sources, they laid down the fundamental principles of socialist thought are but little known and still less critically examined. We are likewise acquainted with utterances of many socialist writers and speakers concerning morals and religion, but it is very often doubted whether they express merely personal views or represent integral parts and necessary consequences of a prevailing social theory.

"The following treatises are written with the purpose of advancing inquiry in the line pointed out, and thus reaching certain reliable conclusions concerning the moral and religious attitude of contemporary Socialists.

"From the explanation given it will be understood that the economic side of socialism such as the nature of capitalist production, surplus value, wage system and class struggle, does not enter the subject-matter treated in the present work."

It can be seen at once that Father Ming's book deals with the fundamental and therefore the most important phase of the subject. It is the phase which should be considered first. There is great need of short popular treatises on the subject which can be in the hands of workmen generally in order to counteract the effect produced by the socialist journals which are being spread broadcast, and also to furnish answers to the species arguments which are used by curbstone and roadside propagators of socialistic heresy. We have many excellent works of a more pretentious kind, and the one before us is not the least of them.

THE DEGREES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. A Method of Directing Souls According to Their Progress in Virtue. By the *Abbe A. Saudreau*, director of the mother house of the Good Shepherd at Angers. Translated from the French by Dom. Bede Camm, O. S. B., of Erdington Abbey, Birmingham. *Permissu Superiorum*. In two volumes. 12mo., 331 and 306. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. 1907.

This is an especially appropriate time for a new book on the spiritual life, when men and women seem to be getting farther away from it every day: some of them wilfully and some through imitation, but most of them through ignorance due to faulty education.

At such a time if they could be induced to sit at the feet of a master like the author of this book, they would learn true wisdom. The translator says:

"The work which I have here the privilege of introducing to English readers is already well known and highly valued in France and other countries. I have undertaken the translation at the wish of my abbot and with the permission of the author, in the confident expectation that a book so clear and admirable will be as much appreciated by English-speaking Catholics as it has been by their brethren on the Continent. For this book is well fitted to become the spiritual companion of souls who are entering on the way to perfection, and they will find in it a sure and faithful guide. Though primarily intended for priests and religious, it is by no means adapted for them alone, and there are few, indeed, who are in earnest about their salvation who will not get help and light from its perusal.

"The structure of the book is founded on St. Teresa's 'Interior Castle,' and it may in some sense be regarded as a commentary on that immortal work, yet the author has illustrated and enforced the teachings of the Seraph of Carmel from the writings of innumerable other saints with such skill that the whole work has not become a mere mosaic of quotations, but a luminous exposition of the science of perfection."

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPES, A. D. 754-1073.. By *Mgr. L. Duchesne, D. D.*, Director of the *Ecole Française* at Rome. Authorized translation from the French by *Arnold Harris Mathew* (De Jure Earl of Landaff, of Thomastown, County Tipperary). Large 8vo., pp. 312. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

Always a living subject of universal interest, the temporal powers of the Popes is most frequently too little understood and an object of dispute. Hence a work on the subject from a learned writer especially equipped for the task is of more than passing interest. The history of the book is thus told:

"This book is the outcome of a course of lectures given at Paris some twelve years ago. They made their first public appearance collected and printed in a review and afterwards a fairly large selection of them was placed at the disposition of the public. As the first edition of the lectures is now exhausted, I am, in accordance with request, bringing out another. This, however, is rather out of deference to the advice of my publisher than to any deep sense of book importance. So many people have written on the subject, and with so much erudition. At least I suppose so; but not being a person of unlimited leisure, I have, as a rule, confined myself to the study of original documents, without unduly troubling myself about

the lucubrations to which they have given rise. Few foot notes will be found in these pages, for I have been chary of references, even with regard to my own first-hand investigations. Many details are explained in my notes on the *Liber Pontificalis*, to which the learned and conscientious reader is respectfully referred. Small works of this kind are intended for the average reader.

"For the benefit of the latter, then, I have tried to explain the formation of the little Pontifical State in the eighth century, and how the conditions under which it worked during the first three centuries of its existence are connected with the great religious conflicts in the time of Gregory VII. It is true that the subject may appear remote, but as long as it is a question of the Church and of Italy, its interest can never pall."

On the contrary, the book is very interesting and very valuable, because a right understanding of the beginning of the temporal power is essential to all who wish to know the subject. This right understanding may be gotten from this book.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE BEFORE THE BAR OF REASON. By the *Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL. D.*, author of "Notes on Ingersoll," "Tactics of Infidels," "Thesaurus Biblicus," etc. Edited by *Rev. A. S. Quinlan*. 12mo., pp. 212. Christian Press Association Publishing Company, 26 Barclay street, New York.

"'Christian Science Before the Bar of Reason' is a reply of the *Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL. D.*, to *Mr. W. D. McCracken*, the leading exponent of Christian Science in New York city, in refutation of its teachings as explained and defended by him. When the articles of which this volume is composed made their appearance in the columns of the *New York Freeman's Journal* they immediately aroused deep interest in the subject under discussion and elicited the expression of many favorable opinions. Repeated requests strongly urging their reproduction seemed to indicate a demand for their publication in book form. As the learned author was unwilling to undertake the labor involved in collecting and arranging the original articles for publication, the present writer, possessing exceptional opportunities of knowing the author's views and benefiting by his suggestions, assumed the task. While the original text, with the exception of a few unimportant changes, has been preserved substantially intact, its form has undergone quite a comprehensive rearrangement in the division of the matter into chapters. An additional feature of the work which the editor hopes will appeal favorably to the reader is the brief summary in short captions preceding each chapter, whereby he may at a glance obtain a fair idea of its contents."

Those who have seen these articles when they first appeared will remember their great value and welcome them in permanent form.

Those who have not seen them before will recognize at once Dr. Lambert's power in dealing with a subject which has attracted such widespread attention, and which has almost deceived even the elect sometimes.

THE ST. NICHOLAS SERIES. Edited by the *Rev. Dom. Bede Camm, O. S. B.* Each volume in foolscap, 8vo., with six three-color process illustrations.

BARNABY BRIGHT. By *Rev. David Bearne, S. J.* Two volumes.

THE STORY OF BLESSED MORE. By a nun of Tyburn Convent.

FATHER MATHEW. By *Katharine Tynan.*

JEANNE D'ARC: THE MAID OF FRANCE. By *C. M. Anthony.*

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY. By *Rev. Robert Hugh Benson.*

VITTORINO DA FELTRE: A PRINCE OF TEACHERS. By a Sister of Notre Dame.

THE LEGEND OF ST. CHRISTOPHER. By *Rev. Cyril Martindale, S. J.*

GABRIEL GARCIA MORENO. By the *Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott.*

CARDINAL WILLIAM ALLEN. By *Rev. Dom. Bede Camm, O. S. B.*

BLESSED EDMUND CAMPION. By *Louise Imogen Guiney.*

CARDINAL POLE. By *J. M. Stone.*

THE MAN'S HANDS. By *Rev. R. P. Garrold, S. J.*

THE STORY OF THE ENGLISH POPE. By *F. M. Steele.*

These are splendid little specimens of book making. They attract the reader at once by their large, clear type, clean paper, colored pictures and red clothing binding, with gold ornamentation. Unconsciously one would pick them from a book shelf and open them. If he does, he is won, for in this case he will learn that he may judge the book by the cover.

The list of subjects is very inviting, and one can see at a glance that most of them are new in easily accessible form. They are by authors chosen for their special fitness, and therefore they have a real lasting value. We hope that the series will be continued indefinitely with the same wise discretion as to subjects and writers.

RAMBLES IN EIRINN. By *William Bulfin* (Che Buono). 12mo., pp. 450. With illustrations and maps made under the author's direction. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1907.

"These pages are the outcome of about three thousand miles of touring within the four seas of Ireland. They were written more or less hurriedly, as opportunity offered, here and there on the road, at irregular intervals, generally out of reach of books of reference; and with the sole object of sharing the writer's thoughts and feelings with certain Irish exiles on the other side of the world."

They are all the more delightful because of their informality. They give charming snap shots of the people and the country and make the reader long to be there. The pathetic touches complete the combination of laughter and tears so characteristic of the people and the climate. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the book was made for amusement only. It is brimful of useful solid information.

54/876/

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

